

JPRS 72109

25 October 1978

EAST

EUROPE

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS
No. 1601

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000412 129

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET		1. Report No. JPRS 72109	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE - POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, NO. 1601		5. Report Date 25 October 1978		
6.				
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.		
		11. Contract/Grant No.		
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered		
		14.		
15. Supplementary Notes				
16. Abstracts The serial report contains articles on official party and government pronouncements and writings on significant domestic political developments; information on general sociological problems and developments in such areas as demography, manpower, public health and welfare, education, and mass organizations; and articles on military and civil defense, organization, theory, budgets, and hardware.				
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors				
<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs <input type="checkbox"/> Albania <input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> East Germany <input type="checkbox"/> Hungary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Romania <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia		Propaganda Political Science Sociology Military Organizations		
17b. Identifiers /Open-Ended Terms				
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 15				
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 94	
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price	

25 October 1978

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE
 POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1601

CONTENTS

PAGE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Czechoslovak Dissidents Interviewed in Madrid (Ignacio Cembrero; DIARIO 16, 7 Aug 78)	1
CSR Premier Discusses Czech-Slovak Cooperation (Josef Korcak; TVORBA, 23 Sep 78)	7

EAST GERMANY

Development of Controversial GDR Literature Analyzed (Joerg Bernhard Bilke; DAS PARLAMENT, 10 Jun 78)	15
---	----

POLAND

Administration Officials Complain About Bureaucratic Chaos (Justus; GLOS PRACY, 15 Jun 78)	45
Nazi Bunker Adapted for Civil Defense Training (Stanislaw Zimnicki; PREZEGLAD OBRONY CYWILNEJ, May 78)	48
Survey Assesses Ideological Attitudes of Youth (Kazimierz Wasiak; RAZEM, 26 Mar 78)	51

ROMANIA

Ceausescu Stand on Foreign Policy Hailed by Cluj Weekly (Ioan Chis; TRIBUNA, 17 Aug 78)	60
Dispute Over Status of Bessarabia in 1878 Recalled (Vasile Maciu; ANALE DE ISTORIE, Jul-Aug 78).....	63

CONTENTS. (Continued)

Page

YUGOSLAVIA

Stane Dolanc Interviewed at His Vacation Home on Korcula (Stane Dolanc Interview; SLOBODNA DALMACIJA, 12 Aug 78)	84
--	----

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

CZECHOSLOVAK DISSIDENTS INTERVIEWED IN MADRID

Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 7 Aug 78

[Interview with Czechoslovak dissidents in Madrid by Ignacio Cembrero:
"Eurocommunism Finds Its Inspiration in 'Prague's Spring'"]

[Text] On August 3, 1978, the representatives of the Soviet, Bulgarian, Polish, Hungarian and East German communist parties issued a final warning in Bratislava to the Czechoslovak leaders to slow down the democratic process known today by the name of "Prague's Spring."

During the night of 20-21 August the troops of five Warsaw Pact countries penetrated into Czechoslovakia to put an end to what Moscow denounced as a counterrevolution."

On the "Spring's" 10th anniversary, D16 [DIARIO 16] had talks with four of its main protagonists: Jiri Pelikan, former director of Czechoslovak Television, Zdenek Mlynar, former secretary of the CCP [Czechoslovak Communist Party], Antonin Liehm, former editor of LITERARNI MESECNIK, the Writers Union review, and Eduard Goldstuecker, former rector of the University of Prague.

[Question] Can one say that a few similarities exist between the dismantling of the Franco administration in Spain and that of the Stalinist apparatus in Czechoslovakia in 1968?

[Jiri Pelikan] Yes indeed, and beginning with the men who carried it out. Both Alexander Dubcek and Adolfo Suarez were nearly perfect products of the Stalinist apparatus and of the Franco movement, respectively. It must not be forgotten that Dubcek was educated in the Soviet Union and acted as an orthodox man until 1968.

I feel that only men with a thorough knowledge of the apparatus are capable of dismantling it.

Now I think the Spanish transition was somewhat easier because of the winning of some political room in the final years of the Franco regime making it possible to catch a glimpse of what the solution for change would be. I am referring to the relative freedom which the press, trade unions, etc., enjoyed.

In Czechoslovakia much had to be improvised since the Communist Party exercised a monopoly over the country's political and social life.

Suarez, the Dancer

[Question] If I am not mistaken, you were personally acquainted with Adolfo Suarez.

[Jiri Pelikan] Yes, in 1967 when we were both directors of our respective countries' television, Adolfo Suarez made a trip to Prague. I retain the memory of a likable man who certainly knew how to dance very well.

After that we exchanged letters several times. In exile, I continued to receive letters from him in which the Spanish "premier" expressed his sympathy to me.

[Question] Going back to the subject of politics, the "Prague Spring" spirit has been compared with the ideology of Eurocommunism. What do they have in common?

[Antonin Liehm] I believe the Eurocommunist parties find the inspiration for their political line in the lessons of the Czechoslovak experience, the PCE [Spanish Communist Party] being the one to adopt that inheritance to the greatest extent. The Italians delayed somewhat longer in recognizing the merits of the "Spring." As for the French, we are still waiting for them to rectify the condemnation of Alexander Dubcek's political actions expressed by their leader, Georges Marchais, 3 years ago.

It is true that the three parties did denounce the invasion of our country by the USSR.

Half-Way

[Question] And what are their discrepancies?

[Jiri Pelikan] We believe they have still gone only half-way. They reason as we did in 1968. They think that maintaining relations, even though deteriorated, with the Soviet Union, will make it possible to influence the evolution of "socialism's fatherland." They really do have an attitude different from ours in the face of the Soviet Union because they don't dare "make the leap."

This does not mean we advise them to provoke a rupture with the socialist bloc but we do advise them to prepare for that possibility, to make a more thorough analysis of Soviet society, including that of their own party during the Stalinist era.

Discrepancies

[Question] What is certain is that despite these discrepancies, the dissidents in various socialist countries, in Poland and Romania, for example, charge the Czechoslovak opposition of being dominated by Eurocommunist Marxist elements.

[Antonin Liehm] The long tradition of the workers movement in Czechoslovakia explains in large measure the fact that the socialist tendency has predominated in the opposition in that the genuine socialists do not feel identified with the regime of Gustav Husak, the present chief of state and PCC secretary general. But the errors of Soviet policy in Czechoslovakia have attracted other sectors, generally less combative, to the opposition. That is why internal dissidence is steadily becoming more heterogeneous.

Eurocommunist Solidarity

[Question] Can one affirm that its ties with the communist parties of Southern Europe overcome its discrepancies and that it receives some sort of political and material assistance?

[Antonin Liehm] British, Swedish, Italian, French and Spanish communists, to a greater or lesser degree, have shown on repeated occasions their solidarity with our cause. To be quite truthful, I should say that the PCE has had the boldest attitude, inviting Jiri Pelikan and Zdenek Mlynar to Madrid at the end of January of this year, publishing an interview with Frantisek Kriegel, a member of the Politburo under Dubcek, and holding a small party in Madrid in honor of his 70th birthday. The French commit the sin of timidity. Their organ, L'HUMANITE, has defended us only a few times when we have been attacked in the Prague or Moscow press.

Minority "Dissidence"

[Question] You pointed out that new sectors with different ideologies were joining the opposition but this does not stop their being the "dissidence" of a very small minority.

[Jiri Pelikan] The steady threat weighing upon any person who identifies himself with the opposition, the measures taken in stages against any person who becomes involved with dissidence have the effect of dissuading people from carrying out any political action against the regime. For no good reason an oppositionist loses his job or his children are not allowed access to education. One step further and the series of arrests and imprisonment begins.

People have just one goal: That of surviving as best they can, slipping out from the spider's web made up of the 400,000 political police agents and informers. Nonetheless there exists widespread sympathy at the popular level toward the opposition.

The man in the street disparages Husak's corrupt regime but what is more grave in the face of the general disillusionment and the feeling of impotence is that one sole ideology resists and even reappears... An iron willed and basic nationalism is directed against the Soviet Union but it also splits the Czechoslovaks. The Slovaks, who were less involved than the Czechs in the "Prague Spring," are today winning most of the responsible positions in the government and party, which obviously arouses some hostility on the part of the Czechs who feel they are being discriminated against.

No Holidays

[Question] Concerning the 10th anniversary of the Soviet invasions is a stepping up of repression anticipated?

[Antonin Liehm] Preventive measures are being taken to avoid any sort of demonstrations on the part of the opposition.

In any event the functionaries of the political police have not gone off on any holidays this year.

[Question] Now that no possibilities exist for the opposition to wrest concessions on reforms from the regime, does there at least exist a possibility for the party's technocratic wing led by the prime minister, Lubomir Strougal, to gain power and reduce repression?

Rehabilitating

[Zdenek Mlynar] I will remind you that Strougal was minister of interior to Antonin Novotny. What he is seeking in his struggle with Gustav Husak is to improve the Czechoslovak economy whose growth and productivity rates have been lower since 1975 than those anticipated under the plan. To increase the economy's effectiveness, thousands of cadres purged at the time of "normalization" and whose jobs are filled today by bureaucrats who support the regime but who lack the necessary qualifications to fulfill those functions, must be rehabilitated

On the other hand, without radically changing the industrialization policy recently followed, Strougal would give greater emphasis to the consumer goods industry in an effort to reduce political discontent by providing material satisfaction to the population.

Bread and Games

[Question] In short, the bread and games formula?

[Zdenek Mlynar] Except that there aren't any games here.

[Question] Since only the opposition enjoys the population's passive sympathy given the fact that no politically reformist tendency exists within the CCP and that 100,000 Soviet soldiers are permanently stationed on Czechoslovak territory, what solution do you propose and what hopes do you have?

Consumer Goods

[Zdenek Mlynar] For any liberalization in the socialist bloc countries to be able to develop the Soviet Union will have to reduce its pressure. I am convinced that the USSR cannot go on expending 12 percent of its arms budget to maintain hundreds of thousands of soldiers in Central Europe and along the Chinese border. Soviet society demands better living conditions. It asks to be enabled to have access to a large quantity of consumer goods.

To satisfy these aspirations, Moscow will have to reduce its military and political control over its allies. And the latter in turn will be able to come up with political models different from that of the Soviet union as and when they give the Soviet Union guarantees of their loyalty to the Warsaw Pact. At most we can hope for a "Finlandization" of Czechoslovakia.

[Jiri Pelikan] It is appropriate to take into account that behind Brezhnev and his team a new generation is drawing closer to power, a generation made up of technocrats, and these future leaders know that to try to "Sovietize," or rather "to Russify" Central Europe is a futile task. The Soviet Union can swallow up Central Europe but it will not manage to digest it.

Yugoslavia in the Warsaw Pact

[Question] This "Finlandizing" of Czechoslovakia would imply that Europe finds itself in a period of slackening. But both the repercussions of the interbloc confrontation in Africa and the possible entry of Spain into NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] may again create a new cold war in Europe.

[Jiri Pelikan] Of course the "shifting of Central Europe from its orbit" can only occur in a period of slackening. And in addition to the possible entry of Spain into NATO, Soviet pressures tend to force Yugoslavia to join the Warsaw Pact. After Tito's demise. In this regard, the Soviet Army generals stationed in my native town of Olomouc admit when they get drunk that they are determined to have Yugoslavia join the Pact. This, of course, is not going to help reduce tension in Europe.

[Question] It has been rumored in Madrid that your visit here could be used for political purposes. Do you consider that it is being so used?

[Antonin Liehm] If we were invited, we assumed it was not to do us a favor. We accept all invitations, exclusive of those of fascists and certain leftist circles which even though they think us to be right, ask us to remain silent on certain issues. To reject them would amount to condemning ourselves to silence which is precisely what the Czechoslovak regime is trying to do.

8094

CSO: 8048/2311

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

CSR PREMIER DISCUSSES CZECH-SLOVAK COOPERATION

Prague TVORBA in Czech No 34, 23 Sep 78 pp 3, 5

[Article by Josef Korcak, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and CSR premier: "Revolutionary Legacy of the Slovak National Uprising and the Present"]

[Text] These days we recall one of the most heroic events of our modern history, namely, the 34th anniversary of the Slovak National Uprising. The test of time and the dynamics of social transformations have convincingly proved the historical significance of this great event of domestic resistance, namely, the beginning of the national democratic revolution and a basic watershed in the solution of the nationality question. The Slovak National Uprising, as a manifestation of genuine patriotism, at the same time was--because of its role in the European antifascist resistance, the participation of members of 27 different countries, and its goals--an important international event. The Slovak people, led by the Slovak Communist Party, created through its heroic armed uprising in the fall of 1944 a vast liberated territory. Through the installation of political power based on the revolutionary activity of the working class in close relationship with the peasantry, internationalist ideas of a joint state consisting of two equal nations, and close cooperation with the Soviet Union, it laid the foundations of a people's democratic Czechoslovakia. In line with the Moscow-based leadership of the CPCZ, the will of the people created, through a revolutionary path, a new relationship between our nations. Later, this new relationship was incorporated in the Kosice Government Program and has become a firm, permanent basis of fraternal cooperation in a joint state.

Shortly after the outbreak of the Slovak National Uprising, Klement Gottwald emphasized its military, political and moral significance. He expressed a belief that it would contribute to the strengthening of fraternal friendship of the nations in the new Czechoslovakia which would be based on the principle of equality. His forward-looking attitude was based on a deep understanding of the just cause of Slovak workers. His attitude also expressed support for the policy of the fifth central leadership of the CPSL, in which an important role was played by Comrade Gustav Husak.

This attitude also helped in the introduction of the classic Marxist-Leninist approach to the solution of the nationality question and to overcoming false bourgeois nationalist concepts. The uprising of the Slovak people positively affected the antifascist struggle in Czech lands as well. It was a valuable moral help in the complicated conditions of the Czech resistance. It contributed to activating the partisan movement, especially in eastern Moravia. The contents of underground communist periodicals show that the ideas of the Slovak National Uprising raised serious questions to be considered in connection with the prospects of the national liberation struggle. The experience of the Slovak National Uprising contributed to verifying the correctness of the programmatic principles of the Czech resistance movement and became one of the inspirations for the May uprising of the Czech people in 1945.

The postwar years have convincingly shown that only a socialist solution of the nationality question leads to the free and full development of nations and nationalities and to their equal and voluntary cooperation based on mutual assistance and trust. The postwar years have also confirmed that this solution is possible only if it is an inseparable part of the struggle for the victory of the working class, for the elimination of private ownership, and for the establishment of the leading role of the Communist Party. The idea expressed by Ladislav Novomesky, namely, that the "Slovak National Uprising also becomes the subconsciousness of the Czech people as a joint affair which would create the prerequisites for joint national pride," was realized. It shows the greatness and the strength of our common traditions and points to the path forward.

This year's commemoration of the traditions and legacy of the Slovak National Uprising acquires special significance because of its similarity in context and topic to other significant events of our modern history. During the celebrations of the 30th anniversary of the February events of 1948, we reminded ourselves again that this victory had grown naturally from the historical experience of the working masses and from the traditions of century-long struggles for national and social liberation.

Soon we will recall the 60th anniversary of the founding of Czechoslovakia, the creation of an independent joint state of Czechs and Slovaks, which came into existence as a result of the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution and of the efforts of the working class to achieve a nationally just social system. There then appeared more favorable conditions for the development of national life, for a further development in the struggle for the social and political rights of the working people. During the 20 years of its rule, the ruling bourgeoisie however, failed to create conditions for a life of equality for Czechs and Slovaks in their joint state. Through its exploiting and suppressive policy, the bourgeoisie undermined the very foundations of the Czechoslovak state and brought grist to the mill of the reactionary forces. The 40th anniversary of the Munich betrayal and the developments which aimed at the dismemberment of the republic are a lesson which show that the then ruling classes

were unable internally and internationally to safeguard our national freedom and state independence.

In the fall we will also celebrate the 10th anniversary of the creation of the Czechoslovak socialist federation, which is a milestone in the culmination of relations between our nations based on the Leninist principles of equality and equal rights. In accordance with the "Lessons from the Crisis Development in the Party and Society in the Period Following the 13th CPCZ Congress," the highest party and state organs pay systematic attention to nationality problems. They see in this an inseparable part of the program for building a developed socialist society, and at the same time they do not forget that the national problem is one of the areas subject to hostile attacks. The principled and internationalist solution of the nationality problem is related to concern for the harmonious development of every part of our socialist society, to the practical realization of the socialist ideals of justice, equality and the material and cultural improvement of all social groups, and to concern for the welfare and happiness of citizens regardless of their nationality.

The entire history of the CPCZ during the past 57 years is full of the struggles for a just solution of the nationality problem which would correspond to the interests of the working class and its revolutionary mission. These struggles are connected with the strengthening of the internationalist character of the CPCZ from the viewpoint of both basic programmatic goals and the content, method of political work and composition of the membership. After eliminating certain one-sided attitudes vis-a-vis the nationality policy in the past, the CPCZ has become, since April 1969, a fully integrating force of the working people, of both nations and all nationalities. The CPCZ successfully brings together the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia of our entire country in order to realize its program of building a developed socialist society on the basis of a common Marxist-Leninist ideology. In the resolution of the nationality question, too, it is confirmed that when the CPCZ is consistently guided by the Leninist teaching it has always achieved good results. This applies especially to the most recent period, which even in this respect has been one of the most successful ones. Improvement of fraternal unity and cooperation leads to the full economic, social and cultural development of the Czech and Slovak nations, as well as to their further rapprochement. It also becomes a significant source of the strength and dynamics of our socialist society and of the strengthening of the Czechoslovak state.

The 15th Congress emphasized in the area of nationality policy a clear line: "The party will continue to create the prerequisites for the full development of our socialist nations and nationalities, for the development of their progressive traditions and national cultures. While respecting national traits, the point of departure will be the awareness that the most decisive factor are those things which link our nations to one another and which make it possible to utilize the advantages of the socialist system for the common advantage and welfare. While respecting the federal

system in our state, we will continue to build the national economy as a common whole. We will strengthen the unity of our nations and nationalities, improve the consciousness of the Czechoslovak state and thus strengthen the power of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic."

In this spirit the CSR Government formulated in its Programmatic Declaration of 16 December 1976 the goals of its future activity. The Czech Government is consistently guided by the principle that development in the Czech lands is possible only in indivisible unity with a successful building of the entire Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The work of the government stems from the responsibility for a growing share of the national organs in solving the state-wide questions and, together with securing tasks which are within the jurisdiction of the Czech Government, creates conditions for the fulfillment of the tasks of the federal government. By increasing attention to specific Czech problems, we are contributing to strengthening our joint state of Czechs and Slovaks and to developing a joint economy and the growth of socialist culture. In the spirit of the principles of the Czechoslovak federation, we are improving close collaboration with the federal government and strengthening cooperation with the government of the Slovak Socialist Republic.

The experience of the Czech government and the practice of the Czech National Council, the Central Committee of the Czech National Front and other national organs confirm the correctness of the direction of the CPCZ policy in solving the nationality question through application of the Leninist principle of socialist federation. The transformation of the Czechoslovak state based on federal principles means overcoming an outdated approach vis-a-vis this problem and recognizing the political and constitutional aspects of these principles. The above solution is in the interest of the Czech nation itself and creates favorable objective conditions for its further full development. By fulfilling this aspect of the revolutionary legacy of the Slovak National Uprising and the entire national liberation struggle, we are creating the conditions for further improvement in fraternal cooperation between our nations and nationalities, for strengthening the united consciousness of the Czechoslovak people based on the principles of socialist internationalism and patriotism. The evaluation made by the Czech Government in the middle of the Sixth Five-Year Plan in the spirit of the resolutions of the 11th session of the CPCZ again showed that strengthening a joint attitude of both our national republics facilitates and accelerates putting our plans into practice.

It is in the interest of all citizens of our country--regardless of their nationality and the place where they live or work--to have the mechanism of the federal and national organs operate in the most effective way for the benefit of the inhabitants of the entire country. It is in our interest to have this mechanism serve our mutual enrichment by good results of work in all areas of socialist construction and to make possible an effective exchange of experiences and the broadest possible mutual understanding. We are orienting the work of all levels of management and of every

link in our political system toward such strengthening of all the creative forces of the Czech and Slovak people and members of other nationalities of our country. The time-tested fraternal relations between the krajs, okreses, communities and villages of the two parts of our country serve the same purpose. We also see to it that the 400,000 citizens of Slovak nationality who live and work in the Czech Socialist Republic work well and live happily among us. In the interest of creating conditions for a full safeguarding of nationality rights of all citizens of the CSR, there has been in existence, since 1970, a Council for Nationalities which functions as an advisory and coordinating organ of the government.

During the Slovak National Uprising the people's masses unanimously called for the restoration of a joint state of Czech and Slovaks built on socially just foundations. The socialist revolution created the indispensable social conditions for the accelerated and full development of Slovakia as part of a united Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. We have in mind not only the political or legal solution of the problem, but in the first place the creation of a solid material basis for friendship and cooperation between the nations and the realization of all conditions for their real equality. Hence, the policy of the CPCZ is characterized by a systematic and conscientious effort for the economic, social and cultural development of Slovakia within the framework of the building of socialism in our country. The basis of this effort is the socialist industrialization of Slovakia which will meet the needs of a unified Czechoslovak economy and create the prerequisites for the effective functioning of a unified economic mechanism.

The socialist solution of the nationality question was an organic part of the general line for building socialism approved at the Ninth CPCZ Congress. In the formulation of the program for the building of socialism, the party's point of departure was the fact that the solution of the nationality question is not a one-shot, isolated affair. The party emphasized that this was a long-term process and an inseparable part of the overall revolutionary transformations.

Our party has always viewed the overcoming of the economic and cultural backwardness of Slovakia as a fulfillment of the internationalist duty of communists, the working class and other working people in the Czech lands vis-a-vis the fraternal Slovak nation. It understood this revolutionary goal not only as a correction of past wrongs and injustice but also as a basis for the prosperity and happy future of all the nations and nationalities of our country, as part of the progressive mission and prospects of the Czech nation. Today, after almost three decades, we can clearly state that the policy adopted at the ninth congress has brought about good results. In a historically short time Slovakia, thanks to the policy of the CPCZ and the sacrifices and work of her own people, has overcome an unpropitious legacy and has become an advanced industrial-agrarian country.

The process of the socioeconomic equalization of Slovakia to the level of the Czech lands has entered its final stage. In order to complete these progressive trends, the resolutions of the 15th CPCZ Congress anticipate a

more rapid development of Slovakia in the future. In the Sixth Five-Year Plan, too, the formation of resources in the SSR is increasing at a faster rate and gradually catching up with the CSR. The development of the economy of both national republics is subordinated to the needs of the unified Czechoslovak economy, is interrelated, and one economy supplements the other.

In the CSR the emphasis is placed on the development of the fuel extraction industry, which represents 92 percent of the statewide production. This creates specific problems in respect to both manpower and investment construction and environment. In the solution of these problems we are being helped by workers and construction enterprises from Slovakia. In this joint venture the people of different nationalities become better acquainted with one another, overcome all differences more quickly, and emphasize what links them together.

The CSR assists, because of its traditions and experience in production, in developing in Slovakia the engineering industry, metallurgical industry, and a few other traditional production branches. The results of the socialist industrialization of Slovakia can best be shown by stating that Slovak industrial production increased 19 times during the past 30 years and has almost achieved the level of all Czechoslovak production in 1957. The Slovak share in statewide production is 27.2 percent and in the chemical industry 40 percent. In respect to the volume of construction work and in gross agricultural production, the share of Slovakia is almost one-third. The needs of a further dynamic, harmonious and effective development of the national economy however, raise ever-increasing demands for improving the present situation in all respects.

The postwar development of our socialist culture, too, is based on the revolutionary legacy of the Slovak National Uprising, which entered its name in golden letters in the history of our mutual relations. The recent establishment of joint unions of Czechoslovak writers, creative artists, dramatic artists, and musicians unifies our forces and assures the development of the activity of the national unions from the point of view of statewide culturally, politically and ideologically creative tasks. This step also helps, in the spirit of the CPCZ policy and our socialist country, to mutually influence Czech and Slovak creativity and contribute to a broader exchange of our best values. Our aim is to have this intercourse of both our national cultures, whose roots are--in spite of their national specificities--close and whose ideologically creative goals are identical, fruitfully influence the forces of our socialist art. This is necessary from the point of view of the tasks of a developed socialist society. This corresponds to the spirit of the best traditions of fraternal cooperation of our national cultures from the period of their joint struggle for national revival, as well as from the struggle of their progressive representatives during the pre-Munich republic. We are pleased that Czech books, plays and music find an ever-increasing response among Slovak readers, theater-goers and listeners and that the opposite is also true.

Life shows that even in our country we are witnesses to a progressive process which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev called the origin of the foundation of a new socialist culture, disregarding national barriers and serving all working people equally; a culture which is socialist because of its content and its main direction of development, heterogeneous because of its national forms, and internationalist because of its spirit and character; in other words, a culture which is an organic combination of the spiritual values of several nations.

The Slovak National Uprising entered the history of our nations as a drive for the realization of political, economic, social and cultural changes which have resulted in a socialist transformation of society. Its permanent values have become, as a result of the revolutionary struggle, great sacrifices, armed struggle and constructive efforts of our people, the foundation for our present life. The legacy of the Slovak National Uprising is part of the foundation stones of the present Czechoslovak socialist state. It is appropriate to our present as a permanent source of a lesson and a part of the internationalist education of the working people, especially the young people.

The 15th CPCZ Congress responsibility and proudly stated that the great differences in the conditions of the economic, political and cultural life of our nations, as well as in the individual parts of the state, had been overcome, that our nations live harmoniously in their joint home. It emphasized that the "achievements in the field of the nationality policy, the achieved level of unity and internationalist fraternity between Czechs and Slovaks as well as among other nationalities residing in our country are among the most significant historical achievements of our revolutionary workers movement, of the struggles of our party and people. To guard this achievement is a never-ceasing order of the day. Hence, we must not permit the appearance of anything that would in any form revive lack of confidence and suspicion among our nations."

The Slovak National Uprising laid the foundations for a new stage in the process of the rapprochement of the Czech and Slovak nations, foundations which, especially under the conditions of developed socialism, are basic tendencies in nationality relations. We are facing the task of a further strengthening of the socialist character of the Czech and Slovak nations, improving their unity and interdependence, and, in an inseparable unity with them, strengthening our social relations toward the world socialist community and its nucleus, the Soviet Union. Internationalism at home and vis-a-vis foreign countries has, in the final analysis, the same basis.

Even in our conditions it is instructive to note how the new Soviet Constitution summarizes the generally valid laws of development of nationality relations in a developed socialist society. The Soviet Constitution emphasizes that "on the basis of rapprochement of all classes and social strata, on the basis of the legal and actual equality of all nations and nationalities and their fraternal cooperation, there appeared a new historical

community of people--the Soviet people." For the CSSR, too, this idea represents the programmatic path of social progress. It is valid for us, too, that the objective process of the rapprochement of nations should be neither slowed by conserving the past nor accelerated by leaping over the necessary stages. The growth of the social and political unity of the Czechoslovak people does not mean the disappearance of national differences--one cannot either ignore the differences in language and culture or underestimate the significance of national identity.

By strengthening all that is positive, we will be faced with the need to be more active and effective in our struggle against survivals of nationalism. Our aim must be not to permit the existence of these harmful phenomena by committing mistakes and permitting shortcomings. We must face anticomunist attacks in time and offensively. In the interest of that policy it is important to manage correctly, in a principled and sensitive way, not only our economic, political and social relations but also nationality relations and, in harmony with that, to thoughtfully direct public opinion in the spirit of socialist internationalism and patriotism. The complexity of such a task will not permit any simplistic approach; its necessity will not permit either temporizing or impatience; its long-term existence will require a principled attitude based on deep understanding and conviction, necessary sensitivity and tolerance and especially a consistent partisan approach in basic affairs. In this area, too, there are many things which can be improved and developed.

People are not born as internationalists. They become so through active participation in the great political struggles of our time as well as in little everyday work. The CPCZ pays great attention to the strengthening of the unity of classes, nations and nationalities within the Czechoslovak federation, to the strengthening of a unified economic mechanism for the entire country, to the strengthening of the socialist way of life, the full development of culture and education on an internationalist basis.

The legacy of the Slovak National Uprising, an inseparable part of the heroic national liberation struggle of both our nations, has a permanent value for our future development as well. Let us celebrate the 34th anniversary of this event in the spirit of the words of Comrade Gustav Husak, who said that "in the conscience of the existing generations live the accumulated experience and wisdom of the past generations and entire centuries. Through them, today's man, class and nations verify new ideas and plans."

1277

CSO: 2400

EAST GERMANY

DEVELOPMENT OF CONTROVERSIAL GDR LITERATURE ANALYZED

Bonn DAS PARLAMENT in German 10 Jun 78, supplement B 23/78 pp 15-35

[Article by Joerg Bernhard Bilke: "Frustrated Reality: GDR Literature Under Erich Honecker, 1971-1978." DAS PARLAMENT is published weekly by Bundeszentrale fuer politische Bildung (Federal Center for Political Education), Berliner Freiheit 7, 5300 Bonn/Rhein; Dr Enno Bartels, chief editor]

[Text] About the Author

Joerg Bernhard Bilke, Ph.D., born 1937 in Berlin, studied literature in West Berlin and Mainz. Being on the editorial board of the Mainz student paper NOBIS, he was arrested during the Leipzig Book Fair in 1961 and sentenced to 3 1/2 years in prison on charges of "agitation endangering the state." In the summer of 1964 his release was negotiated. He was a guest professor at the Institute of German Studies at Bloomington in 1972/73 and founded the Archiv fuer DDR Literatur und DDR Germanistik in Bonn in 1972. In 1975/77 affiliated with the Ost Akademie at Lueneburg and, since 1976, with WELT in Bonn.

Among his publications are: "Troglodytische Jahre, Meine Jugend in Deutschland. Autobiographischer Bericht" (Troglodytic Years. My Youth In German. Autobiographical Report), Mainz, 1965/66; "Die zweite deutsche Literatur" (The Second German Literature), Bonn, 1969; "Auf den Spuren der Wirklichkeit. DDR Literatur: Traditionen, Tendenzen, Moeglichkeiten" (On the Traces of Reality. GDR Literature: Traditions, Tendencies, Possibilities), Stuttgart, 1969; "Die Germanistik in der DDR: Literaturwissenschaft in gesellschaftlichem Auftrag" (Germanics in the GDR: Literary Science on Social Assignment), Stuttgart, 1971; and "Zwischen Buergerlichkeit und revolutionaerem Auftrag. Die fruehe Prosa der Anna Seghers" (Between Middle-Class and Revolutionary Assignment. Anna Seghers' Early Prose), Worms, 1978.

The hardly curable rupture in self-awareness suffered by GDR literature between 1975 and 1978 is a direct result of the mortgage on Walter Ulbricht's legacy in cultural policy which Erich Honecker had to take over in 1971 and which is almost impossible to redeem. It will in the foreseeable future prove to have still more serious implications to the domestic policy situation than the discovery of GDR reality after the building of the wall in 1961. A one-time opportunity existed after his doctrinaire predecessor died in the summer of 1973 for not only departing from the "Bitterfeld Approach" that had long become anachronistic--which was done, in fact, afterwards in November 1973--but also for relaxing the relationship of distrust between writers and party functionaries, but that opportunity was missed. The empty formula often cited, that a GDR author could write about any topic he wanted to, as long as he proceeded "from the firm position of socialism," did not do any good. Neither were the cases of the "song producer" Wolf Biermann and lyricist Reiner Kunze settled, which had been lying around since 1965 and 1968, nor was novelist Werner Braeunig, who died in August 1976, sick and embittered, in Halle-Neustadt, given the permission to have his manuscript "Der Eiserne Vorhang" (The Iron Curtain) published, the manuscript that had been attacked at the notorious 1965 December plenum. These examples represent many other cases of discrimination against authors who were urging a solution based on principle but were being stubbornly ignored by the ones in charge of cultural policy.

Even prior to the Seventh Writers Congress in November 1973 the cultural functionaries reverted to the proven practice of offending the authors when they reproached Sarah Kirsch's poetry volume "Zaubersprueche" (Incantations) with "pessimism" in 1973. Franz Fuehmann raised objections to that, to be sure. Nor did it testify to transparency in cultural policy, which the persons concerned had kept asking for, and which even the Eighth Writers Congress held in East Berlin between 29 and 31 May did not insure, but rather to secret diplomacy in the 19th century style, that not until March 1975, that is 1 1/2 years later, one could read in the two volumes of congress proceedings what they actually had been discussing there behind closed doors, and this also only because some angry authors had insisted on the publication of their contributions.

A hint of what it was that was making headway in 1975/76, when several rebellious authors were punished by publication bans and by being barred from world travel, and what then led to some extremely critical underground literature and the expatriation wave of 1976/77 decreed by the Politburo, could be glimpsed from two publications of the summer of 1974--Stefan Heym's novel on the 17 June 1953 uprising and Max Walter Schulz's novel on the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia of 21 August 1968. GDR authorities, eager to shore up their power position, more than welcomed a book against the Prague "counterrevolution," yet the other book dealt with a theme still forbidden, was marked "illegal" literature and could only be published by a West German publishing house.

Party Legends 1953 and 1968

Stefan Heym's novel "Fuenf Tage im Juni" (Five Days in June), published in Munich in 1974, is a revision the author made in 1972/73 of a previously complete manuscript entitled "Der Tag X" (The Day X), of 1959, about which Robert Havemann wrote in his autobiography, "Fragen, Antworten, Fragen" (Questions, Answers, Questions), that was published in 1970 in Munich, as follows: "My friend Stefan Heym has told the prehistory and course of the popular uprising of 17 June in a novel. . . But the book was not allowed to be published. I at that time resolutely advocated its publication. I have changed my mind in the meantime. Stefan Heym should be grateful to the party that 'Der Tag X' was never published. For Heym is taking over the totally false official reading according to which '17 June' was a counter-revolutionary undertaking organized by Western intelligence services."

What deletions the author made in revising the book can only be surmised. The publishing house is offering it with the book jacket announcement of being an "honest confrontation by a GDR citizen with the events around 17 June 1953." He himself announced in an interview with STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG on 18 October 1974: "I found lots of shortcomings of a literary sort in it. And then I found I had learned something about political matters in the meantime too, had gathered some understanding, mainly about the contradictions in socialism which do, after all, exist."

That this involves the contradiction between the political desires of the population and the imposed system of state socialism becomes clear when one reads this book, which is otherwise altogether disappointing, boring, lacking all suspense and in part almost unreadable, while it has to be recognized that the author no longer holds his original thesis of the 'fascist provocation' on which the first version was still based. Yet even so, he has a bunch of tough guys, pimps and harlots infiltrated from West Berlin and enter the plot as instigators and agents who surely differed in the aims they pursued from the striking construction workers on Stalin Allee, granted that they are only of marginal importance as also are the numerous robberies by GDR criminal types. If Stefan Heym had shifted the action to the provinces, for example to the industrial area of Saxony around Halle-Merseburg-Bitterfeld, the theory about agents to which the second version still alludes would have become fully untenable and a more cogent answer would have had to be supplied to the question why workers could strike against a so-called workers government.

The author has worked up some 3,000 typewritten pages of background material on 17 June. He fully abides by what actually happened but shifts the action to a fictitious East Berlin factory: On 28 May the labor quotas were raised by 10 percent, and then there were riots and people walked off their jobs which on 16 June, when an article in the trade union paper TRIBUENE sought to justify the higher quotas, led to spontaneous strikes by East Berlin workers which rapidly spread in the republic. At a demonstration in front of the "House of the Ministries" Fritz Selbmann was shouted down. When political

demands were raised for the resignation of the government and free elections, the Russian occupation power took action; over 13,000 arrests and several death sentences came out of it.

In order to lend as authentic an appearance as possible to his novel, which is divided into a prelude, 63 brief chapters and a postlude, Stefan Heym has limbered up the text by quotes from newspapers, radio broadcasts and political commentaries inserted into it. The quotes are all quite correct but they prove little. More important is the conduct shown by the personnel of VEB Merkur from Sunday, 13 June, when the new quotas were discussed at an outing they took, till Wednesday, 17 June, when the workers, like minors caught in the act, were led back to the plant by a trade union functionary. Martin Witte, the chairman of the plant labor union executive board, who had first identified with the workers in the quota issue (which makes all too clear what the function is a genuine labor union should have!), for which reason he is no longer allowed into the enterprise, eventually comes out against the strike and blurts these old slogans out at the workers: "Being forms consciousness, social being, and there are difficulties in the formation of consciousness." It is simply inconceivable to him that there could be a strike in the GDR ("Strike against whom? Against yourselves?"), even if at times he becomes dubious about his own function: "Cursed contradiction in which I find myself: those whose cause I am supposed to defend are threatening the power I have to defend." Wilhelm Banggartz, chairman of the plant party organization, stands by his side, and he also mouths platitudes: "In strengthening the republic you are strengthening yourself!" And whenever he gets stuck he inserts the concept of "state security." The most interesting political figure, however, is social democrat August Kallmann, the model of an "honest, somewhat helpless worker," only that the author makes him get engaged in political actions as a stooge of the SPD Ostburo. He organizes a protest demonstration on 17 June although the party has long made concessions in the quota issue. The march through the plant gate, with the singing of workers' fighting songs like "Brueder, zur Sonne, zur Freiheit" (Brothers, to the Sun, into Freedom), witnessed by an impotent and enraged Martin Witte, who has amazingly good connections with Russian officers, belongs among the strongest scenes in the novel.

We eventually get to the ghostly appearance of Russian tanks in East Berlin, and the remaining plot becomes more of a political idyl: Agent Fred Gadebusch disappears in West Berlin, after his girlfriend, nightclub dancer Gudrun Kasischke, was hit by a Russian bullet; agent Heinz Hofer, the son of an SS officer, gets arrested; and the workers, having become peaceful again by friendly admonishment, by no means want to miss the "construction of socialism." The uprising aborted, Martin Witte, knowing full well the GDR system is not politically legitimate, for which reason he pretends to act on behalf of an imaginary revolution, acts up as phrase monger. While the number of fugitives increases and the penitentiaries are getting crowded, he is philosophizing to himself, leaning against his desk: "World history has permitted itself the joke to demand of us we should construct socialism in one-third of a divided country, and this through men who by no means all had wished for socialism."

It is hardly possible to reproach Stefan Heym with being a communist. In favoring the Russian intervention he hardly differs from Max Walter Schulz. That he intends to do away with East-West legends in his book must be appreciated. But then it must also be criticized that he would then, from that vantage point, embellish it with a lighter shade: He says absolutely nothing about the enormous wave of arrests after 17 June, that act of vengeance by functionaries disappointed in the "people." An August Kallmann would not have been able to get away there with less than 10 years in the penitentiary. And furthermore, it is worth asking whether the subject warranted that much of an effort in the first place: the legend of the "fascist coup attempt" which Stefan Heym wants to destroy is tenacious, the SED cannot do without it for some time to come.

However, the book, which today belongs as much among secretly imported underground literature as does Volker Braun's "Unvollendete Geschichte" (Unfinished History) of 1975, is important because it reveals the GDR intellectuals' thinking processes that go back to 1961 but not till 1971 turned into the literary manifesto. The demand raised in it is a revision of the official image of history, not confining itself to 17 June 1953 but also including 13 August 1961 and 21 August 1968, inasmuch as the true hero of history in this novel is the self-assured workers class that simply pushes aside the incapable functionaries of a "workers party." For that reason the state apparatus which worries about its power positions will always certify those authors as "progressive" and "socialist" who illustrate the officially authorized image of history as Max Walter Schulz has done in his novel "Triptychon mit sieben Bruecken" (Triptych With Seven Bridges), published in Halle and Munich in 1974.

The fable of this excessively loquacious book, the cover of which comes adorned in the seven rainbow colors of promise, is utterly simplistic: On 21 August 1968, Soviet tank units are moving through the village of Siebenhaeuser in the Erz Mountains (while nothing is said about the fact that GDR troops also were involved in the invasion!). This interferes with the intended return to Leipzig on the part of SED comrade Dr Rudi Hagedorn, Germanist and professor at a Leipzig institute ("He writes in a collective about the power and spirit of the ruling workers class") and his wife Lea, who teaches, and their children. Their diverse reactions to this "fraternal aid" for the Czechs and Slovaks, who in no way had invited the occupation of their country, lead to a marital crisis that lasts 2 days.

Rudolf Hagedorn, one must know, who earned his Ph.D. in 1956 with a dissertation on Friedrich Hölderlin and by 1968 has become a party hack, without any reluctance endorses the invasion into the "socialist fraternal country" not knowing at all what is going on there. Taking military action against the "liquidators" of socialism in Prague seems "necessary" to him, and only afterwards one could again "breathe a sigh of relief." What remote Moscow has decided in the name of socialism stands up in his mind as supreme, if unquestioned, revelation.

To his wife Lea, half-Jewish and with concentration camp experience behind her, the political situation is not quite so unequivocal. She cannot take this kind of "tank communism" (Ernst Fischer), succumbs to violent crying fits instead and evidently has her own doubts about Moscow's act of violence, which she nowhere articulates clearly, however. In any event, in the morning of 21 August she entreats the Russian tank soldiers not to fire the first shots. In her husband, unapproachable by political arguments, and in the obdurately socialist village community, that entreaty meets with incomprehension and is regarded as an "act inimical to the state" and a summons for the "counter-revolution."

Lea's timid attempts in expressing her own opinion not only make the rural Erz Mountain people shake their heads, they also make for a rapid reaction from the startled party. The LPG secretary, for example, immediately calls SED kreis headquarters on the phone, and a hurriedly appearing party hag from the kreis capital, dishing out soup to the Red Army men, is extremely agitated. Lea has been suppressed, psychologically and politically, by her narrow-minded husband and his super-ego, the party, for years. In her refusal in 1966, to join a group visiting the former Buchenwald concentration camp, because she would have had to spend the night in what had been the barracks of the SS guard, the party at once suspected "class enemy" behavior.

When in 1968, without any publisher's assignment and merely for her own satisfaction, she wants to translate a book from the Russian, apparently a report about Stalinist persecutions in 1941, her husband, Comrade Rudolf, rigorously objects: "Altogether we should avoid for party reasons translating for ourselves certain gripping stories that took place among Soviet people in that terrible year of 1941. Talking and arguing about that behooves us not. Especially not in literary discussions. I do not want you to continue working on that book. And I shall tell you why. We have to come to agree on this in all party-minded rigor: The socialist and civic consciousness of our people, if we think back to the end of the war and the constant attempts at influencing us made by the anticommunist West, has stabilized on a broad basis. Yet even so, this success in our consciousness formation, which might once have appeared unlikely, still does not allow us to expand the typical picture of Soviet man by some human tragedies that have occurred."

Such arguments amount to rather meager testimony in terms of the power of conviction conveyed by the state ideology of Marxism-Leninism, quite apart from the fact that there is no GDR reality that would be wholly screened off from Western news broadcasts and tightly trimmed to conform to the SED line. Rather, the GDR citizens up into the stratum of their functionaries are very well informed about what happened in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The ignorance about actual events brought out here only shows the isolation of a privileged "class" where such functionary literature prospers. The more in the course of years the occupation of Czechoslovakia turns out to have been a super-size political error, the more that novel will lose its status of mandatory official literature and become pulp for oblivion.

Torturous as the perusal of this book becomes, because of its clumsy manner of narration and its turgid language, it yet is extremely informative in entailing this denunciation of the caste of functionaries, a true lesson in political psychology. This class struggle prose ought not to be read as a piece of shabby GDR literature but as a psychogram of one who rose from the middle-class into the "New Class" (Milovan Djilas) of GDR prominence, an ideologist trying like mad to display his all-out "socialist" sentiment to the party. Out of this unspeakable mixture between "class treason" against the bourgeoisie plus the glorification of Soviet imperialism plus "power-protected inwardness" (Thomas Mann) there came this political tract disguised as literature that in no way can compete with the bitterness and integrity in the Prague poems of Reiner Kunze.

Literature of the "Rising Class"

These two novels by Stefan Heym and Max Walter Schulz not only are dedicated to two crucial political events in European history, the 25th and 10th anniversaries of which are commemorated in 1978, their being published in 1974 also marks the intersection between the cultural policy conceptions of Walter Ulbricht and Erich Honecker, even if the willingness for open conversation propagated since 1971 did rapidly revert to the old policy of restrictions. Up to the fall of 1976, however, two threads of literature can be found in juxtaposition, one of which--the functionaries' literature a la Erik Neutsch and Max Walter Schulz--found its official mark of approval in the "Geschichte der Literatur der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik" (History of GDR Literature), published in almost 1,000 pages in 1976.

In leafing through this centuriate work by the East Berlin publishing house Volk und Wissen, elaborated by a 27-head authors' collective under Horst Haase, Hans Juergen Geerdt, Erich Kuehne, and Walter Pallus, the impression arises that live literature is meant to be befogged and choked by an excess supply in party-minded interpretations and Marxist literary theory as contained in bulky compendia of this sort. Party Germanists seem to be depressed by the very notion that literary development could take on a life of its own and evade all planning. That is why the Politburo's cultural planners have bewailed for several years that the GDR did not have its own history of GDR literature. As late as at the Seventh Writers Congress, Hermann Kant, the vice president of the association, still expressed his displeasure in the failure of the Germanists in the ranks, calling it an "embarrassing situation." Embarrassing it was because the GDR citizens dealing with literature professionally could no longer work with the long obsolete "Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in einem Band" (German History of Literature in One Volume) by Hans-Juergen Geerdt, published in 1966 in East Berlin, which only went up to 1964 in the first place, and had to resort more and more to ideologically suspect works by the "West German class enemy," such as the books by Konrad Franke (1971), Fritz J. Raddatz (1972), Hans-Dietrich Sander (1972), Werner Brettschneider (1972) and Manfred Jaeger (1973).

This obvious discrepancy between a West German oversupply and domestic shortage terrified the cultural functionaries, who were smelling some "ideological diversion" here. This misled party Germanist Hermann Kaehler to an insane thesis which he later sought to substantiate in his militant essay "Der kalte Krieg der Kritiker. Zur antikommunistischen Kritik an der DDR-Literatur" (The Cold War of the Critics--On the Anticommunist Criticism of GDR Literature), published in East Berlin in 1974. His point was that here literature was being abused "as a cover for journalistic combat against socialism and the policy of the revolutionary workers party" (Hermann Kaehler), inasmuch as such literary criticism was authored "by our political adversaries, by experts in GDR matters, whose main legitimacy lies in their having once run away" from the GDR (Hermann Kant). Such political fears by some delimitation ideologues now seem to have been overcome, since this overall presentation of GDR literature from 1945 to 1974 was published in May 1976, "in honor of the Ninth SED Congress," as an inserted notice attests, and "especially promoted by the SED Central Committee's Institute for Social Sciences," the "first detailed and cohesive work from the Marxist standpoint" (preface). It is meant to remain for decades, with all its verdicts and euphemisms, the official standard work on "socialist German national literature." Though the book came out as the 11th volume of a "Geschichte der deutschen Literatur" (History of German Literature), and a 12th volume is planned for West German literature, it may be assumed that the very conception of the whole set will grant to all nonsocialist literatures in German language, their being the "ideological expression of a social order in decline," none but marginal importance. GDR literature is rated as the future-bearing mold of German contemporary literature as such. It is the literature of the "rising class."

Right in its introduction, that unrealistic dualism is explicitly confirmed. The book deals with the "preparation, origin and development of the socialist national literature of the GDR, constantly subjected to fierce hostilities from imperialism," yet still unperturbed in fulfilling its "class task." West Germany, on the other hand, had only a "literature torn by class contradictions" reflecting always nothing but the cruel "reality of imperialism."

That kind of historical determinism applied to the development of literature, passing itself off as materialist science, constantly compels the authors to correlate data of political history, cultural policy and literary processes. Thus the three main sections, aligned with the political-economic planning phases, always get subdivided into "social development and literary conditions" on the one side and "real conditions and literary development," on the other. The periodic breakdown of GDR literature in terms of the different SED party congresses remains debatable of course, to say the least.

The remarkably sober and cool assessment of the "Bitterfeld Approach" (1959/64) under the meaningless heading "New Impulses for Literary Life" can only be explained by that this literary movement was a creation of the long forgotten Walter Ulbricht (1893-1973), who is only mentioned once in the entire book, with reference to 1948. Astonishing also is that the building of the wall in 1961 and the consequences of that to literature are totally ignored, so that,

to evade any discussion, they have to resort to imprecise dates. They prefer talking about the "early 1960's" to mentioning 13 August 1961. Yet it ought to be general knowledge that a critical GDR literature that would quickly neutralize the Bitterfeld "cultural offensive" after 1959 could only emerge after the imperious bolting operation and the confrontation with GDR reality. A similarly crucial date for literature was Erich Honecker's coming into office, for which they are using the paraphrase "the early 1970's." It appears the materialist conception of the book is not being applied especially at points where it would be called for.

Elsewhere too, of course, the authors indulge in the "liquidation of facts" (Walter Hinck) lest they refute the historic vision of a classless society. However important their contribution to GDR literature might have been, those authors are almost totally omitted who, in base ingratitude, left the "workers and farmers state," like Gerhard Zwerenz (1957), Uwe Johnson (1959), Christa Reinig (1964), or Hartmut Lange (1965). When a mention is unavoidable it becomes derogatory: Alfred Kantorowicz, who fled in the summer of 1957, is rated as a "later renegade"; Wolfgang Haedecke and Peter Jokostra, who left in 1957 and 1958, may call themselves "bourgeois lyricists"; and Manfred Bieler, who in 1967/68 came to Munich via Prague, had assumed "antisocialist positions" in 1965 already. More objective, on the other hand, are the three pages about Peter Huchel who was exiled in April 1971 and was not yet listed in "Meyers Taschenlexikon Schriftsteller der DDR" (Meyer's GDR Authors Pocket Dictionary), published in Leipzig in 1974, even if they cannot suppress the remark that he found "no productive relationship with the victory of the socialist production relations." Hans Mayer also, who gave up his professorship in Leipzig in 1963 (and whose effect on GDR literature was considerable), must let himself be reproached with having represented an "ahistoric, class-indifferent conception in literary matters."

Political grades are also given to writers who had other troubles with their state: nothing is said, for example, about the fact that Erich Loest spent 7 years in the Bautzen penitentiary, that Peter Hacks' play "Die Sorgen und die Macht" (The Worries and the Power), of 1962, has been suppressed to this day, or that Werner Braeunig's novel manuscript has remained unpublished, even though they do admit today: "In the implementation of the resolutions adopted at the 11th session, some excessive subtleties and some errors were committed." For all that, Wolf Biermann is mentioned in 22 lines, which seems like an anachronism today, even if he is accused of "hostility in principle to real socialism." That three of Stefan Heym's novels were suppressed under Walter Ulbricht, that Volker Braun's last plays were authorized for performance not until Erich Honecker took over, that Reiner Kunze was banned from practicing his vocation for 5 years ("distorted picture of the socialist society"), or that Rainer Kirsch was expelled from the SED because of his drama "Heinrich Schlaghands Hoellenfahrt" (Heinrich Schlaghand's Trip to Hell), of 1973--for all such information a reader will look in vain in this standard work! Instead one gets pages and pages of information about the scribblers among the cultural functionaries such as Hermann Kant, Erik Neutsch, or Max Walter Schulz. This compendium composed by the party Germanists that is reluctant even to mention Walter Ulbricht and pretends it has surmounted his cultural policy conception, demonstrates its commitment to the narrow-minded understanding of literature of the 1950's on each and every page.

Magdeburg Realism

Apart from such literary tutelage there has, however, been for the last 17 years an ever more noticeable trend of counterofficial literature which an ideologically fixating literary historiography either ignores or reinterprets because it has its origin in the crisis of GDR society since the wall was built in 1961. For barely a year after the official standard work had come out, which still includes quite a number of authors who were forced to emigrate in 1976 and 1977, there appeared in the literary journal SINN UND FORM, which appropriately has for its editor in chief the old Stalinist Wilhelm Girnus, that extremely critical story by Volker Braun, entitled "Unvollendete Geschichte" (Unfinished History). This explosive piece of GDR prose, 39 pages in length, which has in the meantime also been put out in pocketbook form by Suhrkamp in Frankfurt/Main (in 1977) but can hardly any longer be purchased in GDR bookstores, was written by an author who in 1945 was only 6 years old and owes the SED state party his school education, graduate studies, rise and poet's glory--whereby the reproach that ideological residues of "bourgeois" thought were being preserved here falls by the wayside.

On 23 December of a year not further identified--it could be 1974--the "council chairman of kreis K" has a talk with his 18-year old daughter Karin concerning her politically unreliable friend Frank ("he should have to warn her"), who has a police record, like his father, and who furthermore is mixed up in some sinister business about which he, Karin's father, is not allowed to say anything; in any event, Karin should drop Frank at once ("it is untenable for us").

The functionary's daughter, always obedient, does not wish to oppose her father's order, however vague his insinuations may have been about "certain things that might change much or, if bad comes to worse, everything in their lives." She calls her love affair quits by telephone and moves to the bezirk capital M (that is Magdeburg) to take a nonpaying job with the SED bezirk paper (Magdeburg's VOLKSSTIMME), but secretly meets with her friend who is working as a telecommunications technician: "They were strenuously trying to figure out what he could be accused of, but they could think of nothing." Finally they reread the letters a school buddy who had defected had written from West Germany. He had known a still undisclosed escape route. "But that was too ridiculous, and they were looking for other sentences but found nothing that could have substantiated any suspicion. It could not be that."

But the suspicion is there. That Frank is under surveillance by "state security" is obvious. When SED candidate Karin, meanwhile editing party speeches for the bezirk paper, dispatches a letter to Frank, she becomes terrified by the thought that "it might be read." In subsequent days, her socialist image of the world becomes sorely tested until it eventually disintegrates entirely. Thus far, one must know, she had been dividing her GDR fellow citizens into two categories, those who were convinced of socialism and the others who still had to be convinced: "Yet

there was still a third position, but that was a lost position. That was the hostile one. With the enemy, you discuss nothing." But now, in her conflict of conscience between her "anti-party" love for Frank on one side and her socialist education, on the other, her eyes are opened to GDR reality. Suddenly she discovers that there is censorship because the bezirk press refuses to print a critical speech by a female worker; when she hands over Frank's letters to the party secretary, her job is gone ("transferred into production work. But what kind of thinking is this where that would rate as penalty?"); among her superiors she finds neither understanding nor that highly praised humanism, she only finds destructive distrust; and she also feels betrayed by her career-oriented father and her mother, that faithful servant to the party.

What makes this "unusually critical and pessimistic picture of the GDR" (as DER SPIEGEL put it on 22 December 1975) which this story has to offer so revealing to Western readers (GDR citizens were likely to be familiar with such facts) is the sudden depolitization process overwhelming the heroine, which degrades the GDR's political pedagogics into an abstract concept totally alien to reality: "Don't let them entice you. Don't lose your control. Stay within yourself. Get blunted. Remain hard. Get blunted to keep your sanity! She felt an inordinate and exotic temptation to turn away from all public life, forget her ideals, drop all her tasks. And to fall prey to the indifference she knew so well, the political abstinence which she had always so much despised." When her whole private life now gets into trouble, she gets a more complex vision of reality and runs right into the contradiction between ideology and reality: "Developing politically does not as such mean developing as a human being; that had to be a contradiction. Thinking paralyzed her. Her head ached."

One should almost wish this thorny road for her, as it finally brought her around to thinking. For as the child of a functionary she had learned to interpret the offense of "escape from the republic"--one that has existed since 11 December 1957, in violation of all human rights--as an expression of socialist legality. Now she has herself become a victim and is gaining a critical distance from the privileged functionaries caste which includes her own parents: "These thick and thin officials who break into sweat when they have to stand up for something! Who care more for the office they hold than for making use of it. . . Who are always defending their rights instead of seeking to provide them for all!"

"Kafkaesque" Tradition

This story by Volker Braun, now banned literature in the GDR because the inside conditions it attacks continue to be the order of the day, may be a special case in expressing direct criticism of the state organs and in siding, without reservations, with the victims, yet it probably also was of importance to its publication that the author's attitude otherwise was known to be one of loyalty to the party. Other authors like Klaus Schlesinger or Erich Koehler face reality only indirectly, alienate reality through their literary craft, escape into nighmarish worlds or utopian realms,

and precisely by that token define everyday reality in socialism, which offers no alternatives, as utterly inadequate.

Klaus Schlesinger's third book, "Alte Filme" (Old Movies), of 1975, with the subtitle "a Berlin Story," is dedicated to the Rostock lector Kurt Batt (1931-1975), which amounts to somewhat of a quality distinction. This story tells, with restraint sorrow, of a plumber's vain attempt at breaking away, after he had acquired, through his enterprise academy, the qualification for being a parts designer in the Schoeneweide transformer plant, whereby he then lost his contact with the workers class and so can no longer find his way in ordinary socialist life. In all this, the apartment trouble which restrains the proletarian achiever Guenter Kotte in his private existence only covers the surface. What actually matters is the paralyzing constrictiveness of life under "real socialism" all around, against which nothing any longer helps, in evenings when one watches TV, but an only seemingly liberating surrogate reality of old entertainment features of the 1920's.

Yet it is especially this escape into that pseudoreality which makes for a deep conflict within Guenter Kotte. For there comes one evening when Jeske, who has let a room in Kotte's apartment, and whose annoying cough rasps through the thin-walled apartment at night, is revealed to be the young veildancer to be seen in one of the scenes of the film on the screen just then. Now she starts rambling about her lovers and her foreign travel of 50 years ago, which so deeply disturbs Guenter Kotte that he gets sick and stays away from his job. For a few days he roams the streets of East Berlin, feels stymied, faces the wall that bars his view, runs after a strange girl in the countryside and, on the weekend, falls in with a group of young people who live in a vacant sphere apart from politics where they want to do, without constraint, their own thing. Spending a night with the girl Ulla, there comes such excess of *joi de vivre* over Guenter Kotte that he, thirsting for freedom, climbs down into the well at Alexanderplatz and climbs up on its pillar, which the nonplussed "People's Police" can of course interpret only as gross misdemeanor.

Then things become again what they used to be. Admonished by the cadre chief in his enterprise for his "thoughtless prank of hooliganism" and assigned to cultural tasks, Guenter Kotte resigns himself to the daily work routine and at home at night still watches old movies on TV, but now full of inexplicable, hardly to be contained excitement that makes him sense there still are other ways to live.

This prose piece is not meant to be didactic nor does it wish to make things come out plain, it only wants to show by use of an ordinary life what precisely it is that might be called "alienation in socialism." In no way does Guenter Kotte comprehend what is happening to him, but his life's washing away makes him suffer, and he seeks to counter that by the means at his disposal. That those means are unsuitable is a realization which leads him a small step further, as demonstrated by the end. Revealing is what the

reception was that GDR literary criticism gave to this story. For example, in her interpretation in *NEUES DEUTSCHLAND* on 24 January 1976, Lotte Meyer, in misreading or suppressing the points made in social criticism, blithely sails past the author's intentions without perceiving the young worker's despair. Existential dread, not allowed to be an expression of the "socialist social order," is turned into a private problem and explained as the character's developmental difficulties: "The story of Kotte points to an important issue in our society: that young people first have to find their consciousness and goal. The author asks many questions, it seems to me, but in answering them fails to be consistent. As cause for Kotte's discomfort he gives us, at least in the way he talks about it, that he still is engaged in monotonous work."

The nightmarish world of East Berlin also is the subject of several stories in Klaus Schlesinger's fourth book in 1977, "Berliner Traum" (Berlin Dream), only that here the political circumstances that cause the characters to react become more clearly visible. The two most important stories, which are likely to have sparked fierce discussions among GDR readers, deal with the building of the wall in 1961 and its later psychological impact on GDR citizens. That the traumatic action of 13 August 1961 has had pathogenic effects is borne out not only by the 1971 book "Die Berliner Mauerkrankheit" (The Berlin Wall Disease) by psychiatrist Dietfried Mueller-Hegemann, a defector. It has also been dealt with in literary terms by Schlesinger. The story about an escape, "Am Ende der Jugend" (At the End of Youth), describes the agony of a young man who on 13 August--discovering, in the company of a friend, an unlocked door in a science institute that leads to West Berlin--for fractions of a second confronts a decision that will determine all his remaining life. What gets portioned out to two persons here, one of whom escapes while the other one shrinks from it in bewilderment, is loaded upon a single figure in the "Kafkaesque" narrative "Die Spaltung des Erwin Racholl" (The Splitting of Erwin Racholl), the finest story in the volume. These are the proceedings of a merely dreamt "escape from the republic" which provides not only a bad conscience but eventually even a split consciousness: SED member Racholl, who from one day to the next is supposed to take over the position of his boss, finds he cannot cope with such a sudden elevation. Going to work by city subway on his 35th birthday, he unintentionally ends up in West Berlin. His frustrated attempts at getting back lead him into a suburban tavern in the back room of which a party court is in session severely censuring his unworthy conduct. It sounds like the logic of dreaming and like surrealist prose, yet the author leaves unresolved the question of whether this is a nightmare from which the hero will awake soaked in sweat or evident reality. The outcome, in any case, is unequivocal: In the subway Racholl encounters himself, the diagnosis of schizophrenia stands confirmed.

Erich Koehler, in his utopian-like GDR satire "Der Krott" (The Mollusk), of 1975, also describes a case of illness, even if the outcome is positive there. Available as early as 1970 in manuscript form, it was first published in West Berlin's Rotbuch publishing house. It describes the illness of cultural secretary Paul Jordan who, diving in the Bagger Lake, gets attacked by the "Krott," a walnut-size beetle, which increases his thinking ability immensely.

The "Krott," you must know, adheres by suction to the scalp of his victim and by vicious venom derails the habitual, cultivated socialist tracks. This upset of consciousness, hardly noticed by others in the environment, then reveals itself in utopian daydreams about a "communist world republic" in which things will be very different from what they are in the grey GDR socialism of today: "There is no class antagonism, no opposing social systems, only, at the most, rudiments of antirational modes of conduct and, here and there, some residual adventurous enemies." But to reach this lofty goal, a big deal of laborious detail work is still necessary. For Paul Jordan that starts with the recapitulation of his idling everyday routine in what comes down to be a rather superfluous activity as a cultural functionary, then turns into some outrageous linguistic criticism of the unbearable political formulas of the "enterprise collective contract" and of the seventh party congress proceedings (April 1967), and eventually leads to its visible expression in inspection tours through the enterprise in order to cancel the alienation from the workers class that has festered for decades.

Timidly applied handles, to be sure, yet the criticism of "real socialism" that might have been developed from the utopian vantage point of someone suddenly fallen ill remains remarkably un concrete. The purpose of the new ideas, wishful thoughts, delusions, caused by the euphoria-spreading venom of the beetle, remains vague. What is it all for? A normal portion of common sense, after all, would be sufficient for seeing GDR socialism for what it is: a project that has failed in every respect. The presumably beneficial effect coming from "Krott," who ultimately gets smashed by a hammer blow on the scalp, does not by that token demolish the atmosphere which defines the functionary's horizon. What is left is a feeble longing for some technical utopia which ignores man living today with all his worry, dread and despair.

Helsinki and Its Consequences

While the manifestations of a more critical GDR literature as they have been coming to the fore since 1971 can only to a minor extent be regarded as adumbrating some political opposition, it is the extremely fierce reaction by party and state organs against the undercurrent of counterofficial literature as it has existed for years, and not only in East Berlin (Wolf Biermann, Thomas Brasch) but also in the provinces as in Greiz (Reiner Kunze), Jena (Juergen Fuchs), and Dresden (Siegmar Faust), making a name for itself by unprinted manuscripts exchanged through change-letter procedures, that indicates they have clearly seen the danger to which the system is exposed and seek to oppose it by administrative measures. As demonstrated by the numerous arrests and expatriations since the summer of 1975--when the CSCE Final Act was signed in Helsinki, to which any GDR opposition can now appeal--they are less afraid of an opposition of "individual fighters," that can easily be eliminated by making them inconspicuously disappear in penitentiaries for years, but rather of solidary actions undertaken by dissatisfied groups. No question, literature plays a special role in this, in a country that has no free press. It is no longer a matter of individuals like Wolf Biermann, who was expatriated in November 1976, or Reiner Kunze, who emigrated to

Bavaria in April 1977, or Sarah Kirsch, who moved to West Berlin in August 1977, or Jurek Becker, who was permitted to leave in December 1977 on a 2-year visa, but a matter of containing at all cost an oppositional movement that keeps referring to the humanitarian accords of Helsinki. That the literary opposition that is no longer willing to shilly-shally but plainly rejects the "social task" is affected by this punitive action particularly is explained by the important function the SED state attributes to the cultural superstructure in the ideologization of public consciousness.

The nonliterary environment of that opposition ranges from Marxist critics of the system like Rudolf Bahro (East Berlin) and Helmut Warmbier (Leipzig), whose arrests may still be seen as intra-party action meant to prevent fraction formation, via the anonymous group of authors of the "Manifesto" that was published in DER SPIEGEL in December 1977, all the way to the appeal by the Leipzig lector Rolf Mainz: "Comrades, do come and join us" in DIE ZEIT of 1 October 1976, for which the author got 9 years in the penitentiary: "That people can be killed without being physically liquidated is not an invention, to be sure, by the autocracy of real socialism, though it did further perfect that license enormously. The war has now lasted for 30 years. 'No squeak from anyone' is the name of its most experienced general. There are no bans on practicing one's trade here; they are neither officially decreed nor publicly discussed. And what does not exist publicly does not exist at all. The GDR is free from bans on the practice of trades. And so it is only legitimate that those who have been barred from doing their work want to be free from the GDR."

This environment also includes human rights activists like the group around the Riesa physician Karl-Heinz Nitschke and East Berlin Professor Hellmuth Nitsche, the resistance activity in the churches of both denominations, which recently forced Erich Honecker into concessions, and culminated in the self-immolation of Pastor Oskar Bruesewitz in the summer of 1975 in Zeitz. And it also includes the opposition among youth, its most critical brains subject to permanent persecution for years.

How little socialist school and university education can do in countering everyday reality is borne out by testimonials published in Western newspapers by Nico Huebner (born in 1956) and Helgard Krumm (born in 1954). They are manifesting a kind of pessimism so bottomless that most of the official GDR literature, committed to state-decreed optimism, impresses the reader as if this had been written in the autocratic Biedermeier period.

Nico Huebner was arrested on 14 March 1978 because he, an East Berliner, turned down the "honorary service" in the "National People's Army." He is the son of an instructor at the SED's Karl Marx Party College and of an editor at the Berlin Broadcasting Company. In his sociocritical study he deals with the situation of a GDR citizen who has applied for foreign travel and is looking for an alternative value system to Marxism-Leninism as contained, to him, in the philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer, whose works are outlawed in the GDR: "Studying Arthur Schopenhauer's philosophy serves me

as a shield against external chicanery and for lightening the burden of isolation, of having no security. 'My philosophy earned me nothing but it saved me from a lot,' Schopenhauer said about himself. It has that same function today in the GDR. His philosophy can best be understood where I live. 'Life presents itself as constant deception, in small matters as in large. What it has promised it does not keep, except to show how little desirable was what one had wished for. So we are deceived, now by our hopes and then by the objects of our hopes.' This objectivated pessimism comes closer to the truth in the GDR and still leaves room for positive surprises. Perhaps that things will change after all and one will be able to cross the blood stained border across Germany without getting bloody some day. My attitude protects me from air castles and thus also from too deep disappointments. So I am all set for becoming familiar, from the inside, with a regime's administration of justice, for it is possible to imprison any critic and anyone who submits petitions. I will not bow down to a system that can maintain itself in power only by a totalitarian manipulation of consciousness, spying on those of differing opinions, extortion and calumny." (Reprinted in DIE WELT, 31 March 1978).

Helgard Krumm's life was similar up to her arrest in October 1977, only she did not come from a communist family. Her integrity got her into trouble while she was still in school, and during her specialist's training in 1970 she was constantly exposed to discrimination. Not wanting to deny her Christian persuasion, she became unemployed several times and was not allowed to spend her vacation in other socialist countries. After having been called in by "state security" and after her personal identification card was confiscated, she fell into deep depression and then, in March 1977, while working as an assistant nurse in an Evangelical children's home, submitted her first request to be allowed to leave. When even her third request remained unanswered, she wrote a detailed report about her hopeless situation that was published in October 1977 in FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE: "I also must let myself often be accused of an increasing aggressiveness and extreme mood fluctuations as a result of these experiences. Along with my fear there comes this uncontrollable despair about my fate, about this life in which I can no longer find any meaning or purpose. Already I have had to sacrifice too much precious time of my youth, and that is the way I will one day feel in looking back at my entire life unless I now do something to restore meaning to my life and still seek to realize some professional and private desires and yearnings. All this seems impossible here. For the last one year and a half I have been without a personal identification document, and I am not going to get it back next year either. My friendships are purposefully being destroyed. My relatives and acquaintances abroad I am not allowed to see. I am now almost 24 years old and should by now have come to some important conceptions about my life and have started making them come true. Instead, all plans get wrecked. The future holds no prospects. What was once a joy in living is giving way more and more to pessimism. How could I think of wanting a family, children, of whom it would be asking too much, in my experience, to accept life as it here is? . . . In utter helplessness and desperation, I am sending you this report, requesting you to exhaust all conceivable possibilities for helping me in getting out of this senseless situation. One hope I still have. That there is a way out and somewhere there are helpful people who know of it. . . This is only a try, for I still would not want to have to give up." (Quoted from the manuscript).

Reiner Kunze and Bernd Jentzsch

Reiner Kunze is the only GDR author who lives remote from literary activities in Greiz in Thuringia and who, in his 1976 book "Die wunderbaren Jahre" (The Wonderful Years), has gone to bat for the situation of GDR youth. When the Fischer publishing house in Frankfurt published that book by this just then rehabilitated author, he at once lost his membership in the writers association together with his GDR citizenship, in April 1977. On 21 August 1968, in protest against the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, Reiner Kunze had quit the SED, whereupon he was banned from following his occupation for 5 years. West German publishing houses were the only ones to bring out his poetry volumes, "Sensible Wege" (Sensisite Paths) in 1969, "Zimmerlautstaerke" (Room-Size Decibel) in 1972, and the children's book "Der Loewe Leopold" (Leopold the Lion) in 1971. Not until fall of 1973 did the Leipzig Reclam publishing house come out with a purged selection of lyrical poems, "Brief mit blauem Siegel" (Letter With Blue Seal) in two editions of a total of 30,000 copies, which were sold out in no time. What Reiner Kunze has put on himself with his thus far last book, "Die wunderbaren Jahre," which also touches on the domestic situation in Czechoslovakia after 1968, is revealed in a letter he wrote to his publisher Monika Schoeller: "After the publication of the book, we, that is, my wife and I, expect any kind of measure (and we truly mean that: any kind) that a government can take against a writer. We hope the worst will be spared us, but even for that I am prepared. Rest assured that I have thoroughly considered my part in this."

And indeed, these terse pieces of prose, foreshortened to make their point all the more pungent, and offering the reader a "uniquely terrifying grasp" (Heinrich Boell) of a constitution of a state that wants to be the "real perspective" for all of Germany, seem like illustrations for Oskar Bruesewitz' appeal: "Do not corrupt this youth!" Here we have secondary school students got locked in their classroom so that they cannot attend the funeral of a fellow student who committed suicide; the wearing of black arm bands is rated as an "act inimical to the state"; an apprentice gets into political trouble because he holds a Bible in his room in his apprentice dormitory; and one student is suspected of "bourgeois" inclinations because she wears nickel-plated glasses. These are like spotlights thrown on living under socialism. Reiner Kunze's book reports of a student who, on orders from "state security," was sent to sound out the Jena student Juergen Fuchs, a friend of Wolf Biermann's and Robert Havemann's. For that assignment, she had been trained for 2 days by a specialist in GDR literature. Nor should those people have found it difficult to look through the pseudonym "Carl-Jacob Danziger" used by the East Berlin writer Joachim Chajm Schwarz for publishing, in 1976, his life's confession covering the years 1950 to 1969 under the title "Die Partei hat immer recht" (The Party Is Always Right) through Stuttgart's Werner Gebuehr publishing house. That author, who wrote a number of mendacious developmental novels and plant reports and worked for TAEGLICHE RUNDSCHAU and NEUES DEUTSCHLAND before he, presumably, realized he had sacrificed his best years to the wrong ideals, should sooner be pitied than admired for his fairly belated insights. There he entered the country of GDR socialism in 1950, bursting with revolutionary hopes,

but then because of some dark point in the cadre act he was expelled from the party. Crushed, he concentrated on writing books and, "semper paratus," would always supply the desired glorification literature that would provide him with a carefree living: "Did he not suspect, when he moved to the newly installed GDR in 1951, coming from Israel, what all this would lead to and how it could end?" (Heinrich Boell). In any case, his autobiographical book, despite all its bitterness, merely is an unreflective curriculum vitae of an opportunist, the psychogram of a scribbler and gloss artist who had been shunted to a siding in cultural policy and who wanted to revenge himself for it. But even this authentic report, getting its counterpart in fiction by Werner Heiduczek's 1977 novel "Tod am Meer" (Death at the Sea), is part of GDR literature not printed in the GDR testifying to the rethinking process that has hit even senior writers and to their readiness in critically reconsidering their own past.

No doubt most officially recognized GDR writers are familiar with the reality of the state in which they live and work. References to that could be found in numerous poems, plays, stories and novels. And granted that some writers have had to stand up only for themselves and their controversial, meaning "realistic" manuscripts, the publishing editor having to mediate between the state and the author found himself in a still more difficult position. From daily dealing with authors who could write but hardly publish, he would get a nearly total picture of events way down at the "base" which "socialist national literature" refused to accept. Bernd Jentzsch had been an editor at the East Berlin publishing house Neues Leben until fall 1976. He had taken an official trip to Switzerland to put a poetry anthology together there. While being there, he sent an "open letter to Erich Honecker." Thereupon, he was expatriated. By him we became almost fully informed about the cultural policy climate prior to Wolf Biermann's expulsion:

"There were lots of authors who had gradually become problem children. . . . Problem children for those people who had to decide whether or not a manuscript was to be printed or a play performed. That includes Heiner Mueller, Peter Hacks, Stefan Heym, Christa Wolf and a whole bunch of others--who were, one may say, reintegrated with literature at large without much ado. And that was all very pleasant. At the time of the eighth party congress, the Gordian knot was cut, and the manuscripts that had been held back could now gradually be published. But now suddenly there are again new books, plays and poems. And now they have another problem. And I imagine there will be a third group, or a third wave, of literature which in its novels, stories and poems is going to reflect precisely that some time, directly or indirectly. There will be another jam. It seems to me that what they were always asking for, to describe realities in the GDR, is very strong right now and gaining in scope and quality--and that precisely is for certain people evidently the problem who find that the GDR intends to portray itself ever more realistically in literature and in the visual arts. . . . I actually know of no author who is totally opposed to the GDR's social system, but I know quite a number of colleagues who have their own opinions about one thing or another. Unfortunately they have no opportunity to publicize that in the form of a newspaper article

and get a discussion started about it, which I consider a very good thing. If writers get into difficulties with the social system in which they live, it often simply has to do with very practical matters pertaining to their work. For instance, they might have gotten the notice that their manuscript was not being published or a movie they produced, not shown" (quoted from WELTWOCHER, 2 February 1977).

All that sounds fairly innocuous compared with the accusations Bernd Jentzsch directed at the cultural bureaucracy of his state after Wolf Biermann had been expatriated, which would have landed him in the penitentiary if he had returned to East Berlin, because he already was on the want list: "In the weeks and months prior to my trip to Switzerland, incidents piled up to an alarming degree, which would seem to make a mockery of our slogan of our 'flourishing art.' I have information about house searches at the apartments of authors and subsequent interrogations by state security officials that took hours, and about the confiscation of manuscripts, notes, diaries, letters and books. . . . It happened that searches were tried without any warrant for them and carried out by force, with a state prosecutor in attendance. Two series of musical-literary performances were forbidden, one of the best known beat groups was dissolved, its members and the text writer of the group, who lost their work permits, were given an unlimited ban on the exercise of their trade. . . . It still happens that DEFA films get barred from regular public performances in movie houses or, without being shown, put into the warehouse, if not given the hydrochloric acid treatment. The plays of one author, whom the GDR Writers Lexicon rates as being a 'political poet of high intellectual and esthetic rank,' are partly not performed at all or, half a decade belatedly, on provincial stages. . . ." (Quoted from DER BUND, 24 November 1976).

GDR Literature in Manuscript Form

The procedure of censorship and self-censorship that mutilates a literary text and yet is being accepted and practiced by the older generation of authors, is strictly being rejected by a number of younger writers who were born around 1945 and later because it threatens to destroy the poetic substance of their manuscripts. They withdraw into the narrowly confined circle of friends and acquaintances where their works are discussed and reproduced "illegally," until they eventually arrive at a West German publishing house, as in the case of the memorized record of Juergen Fuchs.

The process that gives rise to an underground literature is of course nothing new under GDR conditions: The sketches for the two novels that Gerhard Zwerenz published in 1959 in Cologne, after his escape from Leipzig in the summer of 1957, "Aufs Rad geflochten" (Tied to the Wheel) and "Die Liebe der toten Maenner" (The Love of the Dead Men) may well have originated in 1956/57 under the impression of the "thaw." Uwe Johnson's 1959 novel "Mutmassungen ueber Jakob" (Speculations About Jacob) had been presented to East Berlin's Aufbau publishing house but, for political reasons, was brought out by Suhrkamp in Frankfurt/Main. Christa Reinig's 1963 "Gedichte" (Poems), which in 1964

got her the Bremen Literature Award, Hartmut Lange's dramas, not performed in GDR theaters, and Fritz Rudolf Fries' first novel, of 1966, "Der Weg nach Oobliadooh" (The Road to Oobliadooh) came out only in West German publishing houses; Peter Huchel's poetry was printed in two West German editions, while the author was living in internal exile for 9 years at Wilhelmshorst near Potsdam, until he was allowed to leave in 1971; Stefan Heym could only address himself to the literary public in this country with three novels from 1969 to 1974; and Guenter Kunert's only novel, "Im Namen der Huete" (On Behalf of the Hats), published in Munich in 1967, came out after a 9-year delay in the country in which it had been written. As a rule the authors up to 1965, and in some cases later as well, followed, by detours, their manuscripts when they had been expedited to West Germany--like the poets Wolfgang Haedecke and Peter Jokostra in 1958--or they emigrated at least to other socialist countries, like the writer Manfred Bieler, who in 1967 went to Prague and from there to Munich where his novel, "Maria Morzeck oder das Kaninchen bin ich" (Maria Morzeck or the Rabbit I Am) was published in 1969, while it remained unpublished at home.

There also are cases meeting with different circumstances: The already mentioned Werner Braeunig resigned himself and died embittered in the summer of 1976 in Halle-Neustadt, after his Wismut novel had met with rejection from the miners; and no objection was raised by Hermann Kant, the vice president of the GDR Writers Association, when the prepublication of his novel "Das Impressum" (1972) was broken off in the FDJ magazine FORUM in 1969 without any reasons given for it.

New in this underground literature that has been articulate for 7 years is, however, that its authors are an "unmixed GDR product" (Wolf Biermann), having gone through the socialist educational system from the kindergarten to the university and the "National People's Army" and know nothing but this sad business of "real socialism." Their "proof of proletarian identity" can hardly be placed in doubt: "Their fathers are 100 percent proletarians, possibly old communists. The sons have grown up exclusively in the GDR and were reared, by their family, kindergarten and school, in the faith in socialism. Then, when they intellectually mature and gain closer contact with the working world, because of their so-called 'polytechnical education,' they encounter their first doubts. And then comes a key experience which almost always is called 'Prague 1968' and amounts to a practically irremediable rupture with the SED" (Karl Corino).

Life experience from the vantage point of a class which presumably is the ruling one, gathered within a social order that knows of no alternative, and then funneled into a literature that is not printed are inviolable matters. Because these authors refuse to make a contribution to the "socialist national literature" the party would find acceptable, at home at their desk, and in compensation for a regular income, old-age security and privileges such as Western travel, their names appear in no literature lexicon, to public readings they are not invited, and by state authorities they are not given encouragement. Among these authors are not only Thomas Brasch, Siegmar Faust, Juergen Fuchs, or Gerald Zschorsch, names with which West German newspaper readers are familiar,

but also entirely unknown provincial people whose literary existence is expressed solely by that their manuscripts are secretly being copied and passed on: Stage worker Wolfgang Hinkeldey of Jena, arrested in November 1976 and meanwhile expelled; worker Wolfgang Hilbig from Meuselwitz near Altenburg; poet Siegfried Heinrichs of Leipzig who now, after having been in the penitentiary, lives in West Berlin; the singers and song writers Christian Kunert and Gerulf Pannach of Leipzig, arrested in November 1976 and expelled in August 1977; architect Wolf Deinert, who was sent off from the Cottbus penitentiary to West Berlin; the Leipzig couple Heide and Gert Haertl, ex-matriculated from the literature institute and expelled from the party; actor Rudolf Koloc and the dismissed teacher Ursula Grossmann of Dresden.

What Wolfgang Hilbig was wishing for, in his poem "Brief in eine andere Gegend" (Letter to a Different Place), that is, open horizons and the opportunity to leave, was inadvertently achieved by Gerald Zschorsch, born 1951 in Plauen in the Vogtland. After a strict communist education by his mother, who is working as a juvenile judge in Saxony to this day, and by his father, a diplomat in Moscow's GDR Embassy, he like many sons of party functionaries revolted against the invasion of Prague in 1968, was arrested 2 days later and got an 18-month juvenile sentence. In the summer of 1972, working for the Plauen city theater and writing his first play, he was arrested once more and sentenced to the penitentiary for 5 1/2 years. In December 1974, repudiated by his parents, he was sent off from the Cottbus penitentiary to West Germany. In his first book, published in West Berlin in 1977, "Glaubt blass nicht, dass ich traurig bin" (Just Do Not Think That I Am Sorry), are contained the impressions the keen observer had gathered living in the GDR, in the penitentiary and in the West German exile. These are fragments about how those that were born after 1949 became more and more disillusioned about state socialism. That sets in with the teachers' being aghast when pupil Zschorsch appears at the hoisting of the flag in a blue shirt and in blue jeans. Later he secretly goes to the Autobahn with friends to dump out paper baskets on the parking lots hoping to find banned Western newspapers. Or he listens to "illegally" imported Wolf Biermann records or mounts the flag of Czechoslovakia on his window outside in 1968 to bring to mind the German occupation of 1938. Since he will not let anyone dictate to him what to think, he asks provocative questions in his history class about the Russian involvement in the 1939 attack on Poland, a matter officially hushed up but one about which his father, who had then been held in Buchenwald, had told him everything. With an attitude like that, the road to the penitentiary seems a foregone conclusion. But once he is there, he finds out all about "real socialism," which he then describes in his Cottbus prison diary.

On 18 December 1974 Gerald Zschorsch was exiled to the West, where he did not want to go: "Passed the last meter of GDR territory going West. After 23 years I was no longer needed and had to leave my country."

Imprisoned in Saxony

Of Siegmar Faust, a Dresden friend of Wolf Biermann's and Volker Braun's, who sat in the Cottbus penitentiary at the same time as Gerald Zschorsch, there exist only a few poems and an unpublished novel manuscript, some of them sitting in the safes of state security. He was born in 1944 in Heidenau near Pirna, attended secondary school in Dresden, graduated in 1964 and then worked a year in socialist agriculture. The depressing conditions there did not prevent him, however, from applying for admission to the SED: "That took an immense degree of idealism because my schoolbook wisdom about the workers class had gone to pieces there because the conditions at that farm were very backward. My parents and friends did not understand how I could go into agriculture in the first place, stand it altogether and even still wanted to enter the party."

Then he made a living as a waiter in Saxon Switzerland and, in the fall of 1965, was enrolled at Leipzig University for the study of history and art education but, on charges of "lack of discipline and political unreliability," dismissed in summer 1966.

Until summer 1967, in line with the 1959 Bitterfeld slogan "Writers into the Enterprises!" Siegmar Faust worked as a viscose cleaner in the Saxon Rayon Plant Pirna and was then delegated by the working crew there for study at the Leipzig Institute of Literature, to which he had sent some poems. That institute, initiated on 18 September 1955, comes under the East Berlin Ministry for Culture and functions as cadre school for young authors who are trained to become "certified writers" there. Anyone having earned that label may count himself part of the cultural elite in the SED state.

In 1968, however, during the Paris May demonstrations and the Prague reform movement days, the confidence between the teachers and students at that institute had become so deeply disturbed that, for avoiding political debates, suddenly a year of practical work was announced. Siegmar Faust was sent to the Otto Grotewohl Softcoal Combine in Boehlen and found, while with the workers in that coal region in Western Saxony, the same kind of unrest that he had become familiar with at the institute. In that situation Siegmar Faust wrote his "Ballade vom Schwelofen" (Ballad of the Carbonizing Furnace), which he presented in the plant and in which 17 June 1953 was mentioned. This public reading made him lose his job in Boehlen and his enrollment in Leipzig. After weeks of unemployment, which does not exist under socialism, Siegmar Faust was one day asked to work for state security, which he rejected after having consulted with Volker Braun. Thrown out of Leipzig in September 1968, he returned to Heidenau, worked as a waiter and transportation worker, wrote his first novel and, with friends, founded an amateur theater group, which was closed down.

By means of an apartment swap he managed to return to Leipzig in 1971 and to find a job as a night watchman in the German Library. That gave him access to Western literature that would arrive daily and normally land on the "poison shelves." When they then surprised him by searching his apartment,

they found letters there he had written to West German publishers and drafts for an anthology of forbidden GDR literature, which led to his first arrest on 27 November 1971. After 11 months of investigative arrest, of which he spent 7 weeks in the psychiatric clinic of the Waldheim penitentiary, he became eligible for a sudden amnesty on 30 October 1972, was sent back to Heidenau and forced to serve as an elevator operator in a paper factory. There he witnessed the recycling of Western literature into corrugated cardboard paper, which included Heinrich Boell's "Gruppenbild mit Dame" (Group Portrait With Lady), seized by the customs organs from packages coming from the West, and he was admitted to Wolf Biermann's circle of friends in Dresden. He kept applying for foreign travel.

When he had posted a notice, on 29 April 1974, on the paper factory's bulletin board in which he protested against being deprived of human rights, he was arrested for a second time on 10 May and sentenced to spend 4 1/2 years in the penitentiary for "anti-state agitation." In February 1975, Siegmar Faust was put into a single cell in Cottbus penitentiary on grounds of "psychological warfare." When Robert Havemann intervened on his behalf in a letter to his pre-1945 fellow inmate in Brandenburg, Erich Honecker, Faust was released on 22 May 1976 and sent back to Heidenau. He was allowed to move to East Berlin and to leave for the FRG on 1 September 1976. Today he is living in Berlin-Kreuzberg and is trying to make it as a writer. Right now he is working on a 6-part radio serial on "Christians in Socialism" scheduled to be broadcast in the fall of 1979.

Plain Truths

The name of Thomas Brasch's father, Horst Brasch, can be found in a 1973 West German handbook, "Namen und Daten, Biographien wichtiger Personen der DDR" (Names and Dates, Biographies of Important Persons in the GDR). There one can read in chronological order about the rapid rise of this SED functionary who actually made it and became a member of the Central Committee, a state secretary and the deputy minister for culture. In summer 1968, however, the year when the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia, that career was suddenly interrupted and Horst Brasch was sent for party training to Moscow for 2 years and, in 1970, transferred to the province, the Karl-Marx-Stadt SED executive board, which amounted to a demotion.

An explanation for it is found in the atypical curriculum vitae of his son Thomas, born 1945, who had started violating the norms of conduct because, like Bertolt Brecht, he had begun to see through the game of the "ruling class" from which he came himself. Brought up at the cadet school of the "National People's Army," he worked in production for one year after his graduation in East Berlin and then studied journalism in Leipzig. From there he was thrown out in 1965 on charges of "denigration of leading GDR personalities" and "existentialist opinions." Now he became familiar with the "workers and farmers state" from the vantage point of those in whose name and mandate the SED was allegedly exercising its power. Admitted to the study of dramaturgy at the film college in Potsdam-Babelsberg in 1967, he was once again removed

after 21 August 1968, arrested and sentenced to prison for over 2 years because, together with six friends, Robert Havemann's sons among them, he had distributed 1,500 leaflets opposing the occupation, which made his father lose his prestigious position. Upon receiving a pardon in 1969, he was obligated to work as a machine operator in the Karl Liebknecht transformer plant in East Berlin. Helene Weigel provided the young dramatist with a job at the Bertolt Brecht Archives in 1971, which he lost again in 1972. In a series called "Poesiealbum," Bernd Jentzsch edited a small selection of Thomas Brasch's more than 200 poems, which sold out at once.

One must be familiar with these biographic data to appreciate the literary value of his simple yet pungent stories, "Vor den Vaetern sterben die Soehne" (The Sons Die Before Their Fathers Do). Here an author considered undesirable by the culture bureaucracy, but who had in his own way taken seriously the much tooted-about "Bitterfeld Approach," had unloaded all his desperation. These stories, without making any polemical points against the state, nowhere present any agreement with the social order or with a "socialist perspective." They are all concerned with the frustrated escape attempts across the "Western state border" and with the oppressive conditions at the "economic base" where the work that is being done is alienated labor in a twofold sense: "For one thing, the old mode of production still prevails, and then there is this ideology that claims it to be a new one." It deals with the despair of an ex-prisoner who no longer knows what to do with women: "How should I have explained to them that the stillness of a single cell places a ring around the heart and dries out the brain so that it feels like a wrung-out rag stuffed in the skull." Such experiences as the author gathered in prison or during the ordinary working day in East Berlin can neither be repressed nor talked away as if they were "transitional manifestations." At best they can be held on to and set down by literary means, which in itself is hard enough to do, as it is explained in the story "Und ueber uns schliesst sich ein Himmel aus Stahl" (And Above Us a Heaven of Steel is Closing): "Perhaps you are right, he said, actually my head is bursting from all the theories, systems and historic inevitabilities that I learned about. They want to direct our view at what is allegedly big stuff, so that we will not take our own experiences seriously. We may go on the barricades when it involves music or haircuts or pants."

Thomas Brasch, whose plays were rejected by the East Berlin Henschel publishing house, and whose prose texts the Hinstorff publishing house in Rostock described as "gross distortion of the GDR's working world," was expelled to West Berlin on 10 December 1976 together with his girlfriend, Katharina Thalbach, Benno Besson's daughter, an actress at the Berlin Ensemble.

Literature as Treason

Nine months ago the author Juergen Fuchs was still totally unknown in the FRG. Born in Reichenbach near Zwickau in 1950, and a friend of Wolf Biermann, Siegmar Faust and Reiner Kunze, he was arrested in East Berlin on 19 November 1976. The imperturbable manner in which he proceeded would by hindsight appear to lead him necessarily into the penitentiary, but that has a 2-year

pre-history which one can now read about in his "Gedaechtnisprotokolle" (Memory Records), published by Reinbek in 1977). That goes back to fall 1974, when Juergen Fuchs, whose first poems had been published in Bernd Jentzsch's anthology "Auswahl 74" (Selection 74), supplied a critical contribution on Andreas Reimann's essay "Die neuen Leiden der jungen Lyrik" (The New Sorrows of Young Poetry) in issue number 2 of the literary journal SINK UND FORM, for issue number 5 of that journal. Whereas the Leipzig poet Reimann had only bewailed the "decline of formal awareness," psychology student Fuchs from Jena asked the provocative question: "How now if this decline in form reflects a decline in substance?"

He has documented the subsequent steps, from the accusation raised by the party leadership in the psychology section ("a blow smack into the face of socialism") to his being thrown out of school ("on grounds of damaging the university's reputation in public"), to the endorsement of it by the Council of Ministers of the GDR. These are authentic texts full of the highest information value: aide-memoires of interrogations by party and state organs. One "memory record of an interrogation by state security," which is contained in the Rowohlt volume "Wolf Biermann. Liedermacher und Sozialist" (Wolf Biermann--Song Writer and Socialist), published by Reinbek in 1976, was unfortunately not included.

All this monitoring was caused by Juergen Fuchs' literary attempts, so brief they sometimes hardly fill a page in this volume, to present them in the provinces at semiofficial events and disseminate them "illegally," which that ever vigilant "state security" is likely to have noticed fairly early in the game. The first of these 18 prose pieces--bringing to mind Reiner Kunze's last book--(after all previous ones were destroyed out of fear) shows the parents' lack of understanding ("we have done away with it, she said, we burnt it") and the son's resolve no longer to subject himself to self-censorship. Thus he would refuse in the future to resort to "slave language," let alone submit his texts to the authorities for censorship, as shown in his play "Das Interesse": "We are vigilant. Show us your poems before they are printed, before they are read, before they are heard, before they are praised, before they are criticized, before they are written."

Juergen Fuchs, together with Christian Kunert and Gerulf Pannach--the threat of 10 years in the penitentiary had hung over all three of them--was exiled to West Berlin on 26 August 1977. He has reported his prison experience under the title "Du sollst zerbrechen" (You Must Break) in the 1977 October and November issues of DER SPIEGEL.

Linguistic Alienation

Hans Joachim Schaedlich, born in Reichenbach/Vogtland in 1935, up to now the last author to have been expatriated, in December 1977, had been working for some years as a linguist at the East Berlin Academy of Sciences and as a translator in Berlin-Koepenick before he started writing himself and offering his finely honed texts to GDR publishers, who delayed him for

2 years by "discussions" and finally recommended to him to "revert and reconsider." His book, "Versuchte Naehe" (Closeness Attempted) was then published in the summer of 1977 at Hamburg's Rowohlt publishing house.

The title story makes obvious right away that it was asking too much of the GDR editors put in charge to examine this painstaking description of a May demonstration from the vantage point of a potentate of an unidentified state who is--seemingly--being hailed by the people. This man on the rostrum, alienated from the people and engulfed by cheering crowds, shows the features of Erich Honecker, and not by coincidence.

Similar references to GDR reality are shown in the somewhat clumsy sketch "Nachlass" (Legacy), in which the friend-foe relationship between Walter Ulbricht and his state poet Johannes R. Becher permits a sober insight into the practice of censorship which comes into full force only after the death of the poet.

Even so, there are only a few texts--as names and dates are not mentioned--that permit a direct look at GDR reality, such as, for example, "Schwer leslicher Brief" (A Letter Hard to Read), where a worker who was not permitted to visit his sick father in West Berlin requests his expatriation ("requesting you herewith to cross me from the list of the inhabitants"), or "Unter den achtzehn Tuermen der Maria vor dem Teyn" (Under the 18 Towers of Maria vor dem Teyn), where two GDR adolescents give an interview to Western TV in Prague on 22 August 1968, their backs to the camera, of course, whereupon skilled audiotechnicians of the "Domestic Language Institute" are looking for the owners of the "two captured voices" in order to hand them over to "state security." In most of his cases, however, the author prefers to alienate his own texts in distorting them by historical disguise and comes to astonishing results doing so. There is one story, for instance, "Letzte Ehre grossem Sohn" (Last Honors to a Great Son), which is nothing but the official death notice of the Russian foreign minister of 1896. The bombastic Byzantine style of the eulogy on the deceased is so very obviously an imitation of the tone of communist newspapers in obituaries--linguistic satire the models for which can be found every day in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND. And also the text of "Besuch des Kaisers von Russland bei dem Kaiser von Deutschland" (Visit by the Emperor of Russia to the Emperor of Germany) in the late 19th century in Breslau and their mutual warnings against the danger of "Buddhism" in East Asia articulates while it disguises. Prussian and Russian history seems to be an inexhaustible arsenal to the author for illuminating the present.

The masterpiece is called "Satzsuchung" (Sentence Search). It deals with self-censorship and the reinterpretation of reality within the perimeter of the Berlin Wall, undertaken by the paralyzed poet Paul Scarron (1610-1660) who has no experience of reality and therefore must try to figure out what his environment all amounts to, from his window seat.

Transitions: Volker Braun and Andreas Reimann

Now there are also two underground literature examples that have gone in the opposite direction and where the party has almost succeed to prevail with its demands: Volker Braun and Andreas Reimann. A volume of essays, "Es genuegt nicht die einfache Wahrheit" (The Plain Truth Is Not Enough), published in Leipzig in 1975 and in Frankfurt in 1976, meanwhile out of print, had turned Volker Braun into somewhat of a moral authority among young intellectuals. Students in the opposition kept referring to him when they were about to be thrown out of school or had to go through a penal probation period in production. His story "Unvollendete Geschichte" (1975) seemed to be a hint that areas of reality previously denied had now been conquered. But then he came out about the ninth party congress by saying: "For in the party all are equal, and that is the reason why it can combine the experiences of all the different activities and levels in a revolutionary plan." And that he then also withdrew from signing the protest against Wolf Biermann's expatriation suggests his compliance with the official line.

More conspicuous still is the development of the Leipzig poet Andreas Reimann, who was born in 1946 and whose parents committed suicide in 1953. He was placed in a state educational institution and at the early age of 15 came out with poems that showed an early maturity. Encouraged by Franz Fuehmann, he became known during the 1964 poetry discussions. In 1968 he criticized the Czechoslovak invasion, was arrested, placed in the psychiatric clinic of the Waldheim penitentiary but released before his time was up. In the FRG, some of his poems were printed in Peter Hamm's 1966 anthology "Aussichten" (Prospects). His first poetry volume, "Die Weisheit des Fleischs" (The Wisdom of the Flesh), came out in 1975. In 1976 he was given the Leipzig "Promotional Award for Literature." Even so, doubts about GDR socialism, however poetically coded, can be found in his work too: "Air! And which words now, and how, tell, and whom, and without air, the rope, it is, which is strangling me, despair: alas, my knowing we will win is small comfort for the widows, wakes up none of the dead even for an instant of lightning." It may here also be expected that this still covert language will one day turn into an open articulation of where this dread of strangulation comes from.

Approaching the Eighth Writers Congress

The policy of exile and arrest, from Wolf Biermann in November 1976 via Juergen Fuchs, all the way to Hans Joachim Schaedlich in December 1977, which should have quieted down the literary front, intimidated its spokesmen, had the very opposite effect. The writers who remained, especially the authors of the 1976 petition to Erich Honecker, were embittered and, unless they were busy with their own literary plans or considered protests meaningless as such, like Christa Wolf and Jurek Becker, expressed their annoyance in the Western press. On 16 July 1977, a few weeks before the poet Sarah Kirsch was exiled, in August, Rolf Schneider had his novel fragment "November" published in FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, which deals with the fate of the East Berlin writer Natascha Roth. The entire novel, criticized at the Leipzig Book Fair in March 1978 by Deputy Minister for Culture Klaus Hoepcke, has remained unprinted to this day.

A series of "open letters," by which several GDR authors communicated with one another in the summer of 1977 in the press of the "class enemy," got started with Joachim Seyppel's letter to Jurek Becker, who had quit the writers association. Joachim Seyppel who, as late as fall 1973, had moved from the FRG to East Berlin, expressed his suspicion that Jurek Becker wanted to leave the GDR and emigrate to Israel. This letter then was answered, but not by the person addressed, but rather by Guenter Kunert, in DIE ZEIT of 5 August 1977. The answer was, however, so coded that one first had to render it in clear-text: "In theory, all previous human history culminates in socialist society where former yearnings, needs and dreams either are fulfilled or suspended. In other words: in principle, the utopia has now been brought to realization. Life can only become still better, more beautiful, richer and more diversified. Yet this materialization in the realm of needs that are ignored in euphoria and falsely assessed massive realities brings it about that the given conditions frequently turn out to be the stronger ones and start to dominate all else. It means the ideal cannot be applied in practice without reservations, and the rapidly increasing number of reservations will become taboo. Now comes the writer for whom it is precisely this tension between ideal and reality that forms the basic element of his purposes, and so the gap becomes apparent in him and in his work. . . The suppression of criticism, the only remedy existing for keeping societies functional--and without it there would no longer be a bourgeois society--and the stupidity in not understanding the requisite contradiction, this acid test for one's own theory and practice, have brought it about in the course of years that any deviating view is ipso facto rated as an assassination attempt by means of the 'word weapon.'"

Joachim Seyppel answered Guenter Kunert's letter on 11 August 1977 in FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU and on the day of her departure, on 28 August 1977, he had a "special delivery letter to Sarah Kirsch" published in West Berlin's TAGESSPIEGEL. That again was not answered by the expatriated poet but by Stefan Heym, Guenter Kunert and Heiner Mueller instead, who were all defending Stephan Hermlin, whom Joachim Seyppel had attacked because he had, in November 1976, coordinated the campaign in favor of Wolf Biermann, though he would later distance himself from it. And then once again, in the 24 November 1977 issue of DER STERN, Rolf Schneider picked up the quarrel over Wolf Biermann and endorsed the November 1976 petition but at the same time expressed some unrealistic thoughts that are not likely to have pleased the culture bureaucracy: "A year ago we hoped the GDR would readmit Wolf Biermann to its territory, but that was probably utopian, and utopian it has remained. Looked at it more closely, it is somewhat less utopian today than it was a year ago. It has always been the Marxists' business to bring the utopia closer to reality, and reality to utopia."

This is a confusing game for outside observers, all the more so since Rolf Schneider had another "open letter" published in the 28 April 1978 issue of FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, in which he complains about SED ideologue Hans Koch who, in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on 15 April 1978, had contended his political views were not socialist. What all this correspondence makes clear is that even

the GDR writers depend on public debate and must look for exercising their right to it, unless their own media grant that right, outside their national borders.

Outside of GDR borders also has appeared Jurek Becker's fourth novel, "Schlaflose Tage" (Sleepless Days), published in Frankfurt in 1978. It tells the story of the East Berlin teacher Karl Simrock who, through his own fault, becomes reduced in status and turns into a halfway contented worker in a bread factory because he lost all desire for accommodating himself. He separates from his wife and lives with Antonia, who is expelled from her university and undertakes an escape attempt in Hungary, and he would like others to understand his plan of self-education as an attempt of creating a rapprochement between his "environmental condition and his socialist hopes."

Here a GDR citizen is fighting for his injured human dignity, by which this novel picks up the tradition of the Bitterfeld literature around 1964. The crucial scene describes the attempt by the school authorities to pardon the teacher who was banned from engaging in his profession: "How can you hope I would apologize for an injustice done me? How could you expect gratitude from me for a humiliation? And mainly this: How could you want a teacher who is ready to accept such offers?"

Books of this sort, published immediately before the Eighth Writers Congress, scheduled to be held in East Berlin from 29 to 31 May 1978, reveal the deep conflict that broke open in the fall of 1976 between a group of internationally respected, if constantly humiliated, GDR authors and a smug cultural bureaucracy. This conflict is further sharpened by the fact that for the first time in the history of the association since 1952 the group of the "trouble makers" is not admitted to the congress, and that includes Christa Wolf, Franz Fuehmann, Stefan Heym, Guenter Kunert, and Klaus Schlesinger. The case of Christa Wolf may be aggravated by that her novel of 1976, "Kindheitsmuster" (Childhood Models), about which the functionaries have conflicting views, contains some passages that are directly relevant to current conditions in the GDR. There she writes, for instance, about a suicide by a teacher and his girlfriend on 1 February 1973: "For the second time they were turned down and could not study medicine, although they had brilliant prerequisites for it," which alludes to the effect bans on exercising one's trade can have also in the GDR.

The disappointed GDR population has now lived with the experience of the wall for 1 1/2 decades. That its despair over that has entered the literature is by no means astonishing. No longer only the fist-rank authors seek to explore the society behind the facade of ideology, but even authors like Werner Heiduczek who owe their success and rise to the SED. His third novel, "Tod am Meer" (1977), the self-accusation by an author who has failed and who writes down his life's confession while at the Black Sea, makes only for doom and gloom. How cautiously the author worked this out can be seen by the author's adding his own "editorial preface" to the fictitious plot that is likely to be autobiographical. This book amounts to a psychogram by a socialist writer who had only written on assignment for decades and whom his inner emptiness now destroys.

Literary criticism has been talking about a "downright feverish fervor for integrity" and about a "frenzied search for emotional wounds and internal mutilation." It is obvious that such books, honest as they are, sensitively disturb the high gloss of a "socialist national literature." And it was that book which Hans Koch explicitly mentioned in his programmatic essay "Kunst und realer Sozialismus" (Art and Real Socialism) in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on 15 April 1978. It would make the construction of socialism appear, he said, as a "road to Golgotha, a mess of events motivating moral oppression and shame, a sort of beaten track between injustice and presumption" whereby it placed "in doubt the image of society in real socialism."

5885

CSO: 8020/0022

POLAND

ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS COMPLAIN ABOUT BUREAUCRATIC CHAOS

Warsaw GLOS PRACY in Polish 15 Jun 78 p 3

[Article by Justus]

[Text] "Listen, fellows," I turned to my old pals of student years sitting around the coffee pot. "Since you are working for so long in the regional administration, tell me straight from the shoulder how do you view all this straightening out of administrative laws?"

"Well, generally speaking, the activities in the Ministry of Administration, local economy, and Environmental Protection are being organized as they should be; we even have some good new laws such as those defining the status of a provincial governor," started Adam. "Recognizing also...."

"Listen buddy," Antek interrupted him sharply, "he is not asking about such 'positive poisoning' but about what bothers us. And you know yourself which burning hard matters we urgently want to air."

"Exactly," Jurek chimed in lively, "such a hard matter of concern to every official is the mess resulting from the frequent revisions of standard regulations and failure subsequently to issue the latest uniform versions. For instance, the law on urban and rural land management was twice revised since 1969 and the 1961 law on allocation of rural land for buildings was already revised three times, after its uniform 1969 version had gone into effect. These revisions were essential and necessary, to be sure, but require the official always to look up three or four past yearbooks of DZIENNIK USTAW (Journal of Laws) to ascertain which version after these revisions actually applies. Is it so difficult to issue bulletins with the latest uniform versions? This would benefit the official who renders the administrative decision as well as the interested citizen, the legal status would be clear and not obfuscated by numerous revisions. There would be order instead of a mess.

"Similarly 'ancient' is the problem of ordinances issued later than, instead of simultaneously with, new laws. A law provides the general framework, but only the ordinance implements it. Meanwhile, as a rule, when a law has gone into effect and must be applied, the ordinances have not yet been received. What can a local government official do then but tell the citizen to wait, because the ordinances are not yet available?"

"What Stefan says about ordinances is the holy truth, but matters are really even worse than he has told us," remarked Adam. "To tell the truth, one waits for ordinances often not just a few days or months but years. For instance: the guidelines defining the permissible concentrations of noxious fumes in factory exhausts, according to paragraph 3 of the decree issued by the Council of Ministers on 13 September 1966, are still not available. There is also still unavailable the regulation announced in article 8, paragraph 13 of the 12 March 1958 Law pertaining to the rules and procedures for real estate expropriation, which was to establish precise standards for assessing the value of cultivated land. We are waiting 15 years for...."

"Don't enumerate, man, because you will bore this company, interrupted Antek. "I would like to touch on the subject of ordinances lagging behind changes in socioeconomic trends. In the ordinance of 27 September 1974, on setting indemnification rates for urban land and buildings, 350-450 thousand zlotys has been determined to be the average cost of building a single-family five-room house. I take my hat off to anyone who will build one for this money today! The building assessment schedule, according to the State Insurance Agency and confirmed by a decree of the Finance Minister in 1957 (and last revised 10 years ago...) is today already completely fictional, especially after the 1976 and 1977 changes in costs of building materials, while the figures still used today make our life miserable. Another example: the 1959 guidelines set forth by the Ministry of Internal Affairs established the hourly rate of pay for an expropriation specialist at an overwhelming...21 zlotys. This rate still applies almost 20 years later!"

"You have unintentionally hit the next subject," interjected Stefan, "namely the failure to publish legal documents such as those guidelines just mentioned. Too many ordinances, circulars, guidelines, etc. are still not meant for publication, so that neither the citizen nor often even the official who must rule accordingly knows them. One truly cannot acquiesce to this, it bluntly makes for lawlessness."

"You people talk about unpublished legal documents, and I will remind you that matters are not any better with those which have been published. Clerks in local government offices and even in provincial government offices feel a great need for receiving from central agencies uniform current indexes of ministerial legal documents, including regulations as well as circulars and instructions published in official journals of the individual ministries. After all, it is we in local government offices who are supposed to apply the ordinances of almost all ministries. So how is one to find one's way around in this jungle?"

"Dear Jurek, don't exaggerate in your criticism, I only tried to inject a little optimism into our conversion. After all, according to the provisions in the Council of Ministers Decree No 14 of 30 January 1968 on codifying and limiting the number of ordinances within ministries, each ministry is to publish lists of current ordinances every 2 years, which probably will solve the problem."

"Solve the problem yes, but only in your imagination," Jurek replied angrily. "For instance: the list of ordinances by the Ministry of Administration, Local Economy and Environmental Protection was last published in 1974 in MONITOR POLSKI No 9, item 72 and also in the DZIENNIK URZEDOWY (Official Journal) No 3, item 11. The practitioners, which means we below, wait longingly for the next one, and it is already 1978!"

"Furthermore, how many difficulties are caused in our office work by the inconsistencies between new and old regulations as well as by the inadequacy of the law in relation to real life," Antek remarked again, "To be sure, we need, for instance an updating of the administrative code, especially in view of the administrative reform. Or take, for instance, the 1961 law pertaining to cooperatives and their associations, out of tune with the government's currently implemented socioeconomic policy in regard to residential housing construction. Or take, to be very specific, paragraph 14g of Council of Ministers Decree No 16 of January 1973, which established the income levels which entitle one to receive unrepayable supplementary aid to cover the cost of a cooperative apartment. The incomes here amount to 800, 1,000, and 1,200 zlotys per capita. Since then, however, people's incomes have risen significantly. While 2 or 3 years ago we lacked funds to cover the needs of all applicants meeting these criteria, we now have reached the state where funds allocated to unrepayable aid are not spent because of too few applicants with low enough incomes per capita. Life has moved forward, while obsolete regulations have been left suspended somewhere in a social vacuum...."

"It is late, gentlemen, and I am sorry we are closing," said the waiter, interrupting our discourse.

A pity, indeed, because a summing up and a few optimistic overtones to save our collocutors from being accused of utter pessimism would have been appropriate. However, there just was not enough time and there will be no summing up.

I nevertheless believe that, despite all these staggering difficulties, my friends in the state administration will continue to cope well with their daily tasks, as old-timers in administrative service should. This does not at all mean that we should not worry about what they have sincerely told us here.

POLAND

NAZI BUNKER ADAPTED FOR CIVIL DEFENSE TRAINING

Warsaw PRZEGLAD OBRONY CYWILNEJ in Polish No 5, May 78 pp 15-17, 47

[Article by Stanislaw Zimnicki]

[Excerpts] On 6 May 1978 we came to Wroclaw in the course of our reportorial travels. The capital of Lower Silesia greeted us on the 33d anniversary of its liberation with fine weather, sunshine and warm temperatures. Accompanied by the head of the Provincial Inspectorate of Civil Defense, Col. Franciszek Grocki, we set out for the historical museum on Partisan Hill.

Of the refrigerators manufactured in the country, 80 percent originate from Wroclaw, as well as 40 percent of the railroad cars and 17 percent of the steel-working machines. Wroclaw is also an important center of learning. Located here are institutions of higher learning concentrating 9.3 percent of the country's students, as well as museums, libraries, and theaters. This city is an important center of transportation: we find here a large railroad junction and a port on the river.

In agricultural production, Wroclaw Province occupies second place with its four different kinds of grain crops and eighth place in the production of white beets. Likewise, in the field of civil defense activities, Wroclaw Province has placed itself in the forefront of the country.

From Partisna Hill we go to the Voivodship Civil Defense Cadre Training Center [WOSK OC]

On the way there is a moment for some thoughts following our visit to the exhibition, which is characterized above all by its enormous reverence for history. In evidence here is the boundlessness of the liberator soldiers' sacrifices. Their heroic deeds, recalled in the displays and in the guides' words, are conducive to an education in patriotic and defensive warfare and internationalism. The films projected at the museum have a great influence on the shaping of committed attitudes and on a better understanding of the significance of perfecting and developing civil defense--these being efforts at increasing the self-defense force of our fatherland.

WOSK OC operates on "a high volume turnover." Thus speaking to us in its director, Andrzej Loster, a fine educator and organizer. An ambitious program to convert the storage space inside a gigantic former German bunker into lecture halls and the adjoining living accommodations into a residential school was put into effect in 1974. Alterations in electrical, hydraulic, and sewage installations were made. Heating systems were installed. As a result of these labors, the following were obtained: a residential school for 33 persons in rooms boarding 2-4 persons, a lecture hall for 60 persons, storage space for instructional and housekeeping equipment, a library, a director's office and a room for the lecturers, a technical operations room with civil defense equipment, as well as a film projection room accommodating 40 persons. We visit WOSK OC, we admire the perfect orderliness, the esthetic appeal, and the exemplary organization of the instructional process. All the sleeping accommodations have been outfitted with nice, functional furniture, carpeting, radios. In the lecture rooms we find audiovisual equipment, "Elew" cameras, "Lech" graphoscopes and "Diapol" slide projectors. A panel has been built to control the operation of the window drapes, the slide projectors and the camera.

As a result of the constant modernization of the center's instructional base, accommodations for performing group exercises have been prepared, as well as a room for laboratory classes, with equipment for detecting and eliminating contaminations. All the accommodations have been provided with radio sets, and they have internal telephone connections. The technical operations room has been enhanced by a series of ingenious model displays of shelters, methods of rescuing people from wrecked shelters and from the top floors of buildings, methods of repairing water and gasoline grids, etc., and special and veterinary treatment methods.

Since 1976 the center has availed itself of the civil defense training unit connected with the Wroclaw Polytechnic Institute, which conducts laboratory classes in the fields of medicine, sanitation, fire prevention and scientific lifesaving. This unit is also used for laboratory classes of the Wroclaw order for self-defense services. WOSK OC conducts some of the classes directly on the premises of industrial concerns, including the "Hutman," which is known for its good civil defense work.

WOSK OC has become a true breeding ground for cadres. It trains OC leaders for cities and communities and executive TOS and ZOS [local and plant civil defense units] cadres of the lower Silesian region. It trains students from the provinces of Jelenia Gora, Legnica, Walbrzych and Lesko. The courses last 2 weeks as a rule. In the past year the center has organized training for the managerial crew of the Automobile Transport Union, for OHP [Volunteer Labor Brigades] commanders, and PO instructors.

Similar training has been organized for the Copper Miners and Foundry Workers Alliance in Lubin, the Central Association of Cooperative Labor, and the Wroclaw chapter of the Polish Academy of Science. The development of the center's activity is best illustrated by the number of persons trained: in 1974, 206 persons, and in the past year, 1,143.

Not the least of the center's attainments is to have organized an experienced group of lecturers whose instructional skills and expertise are constantly rising.

Such lecturers as Res Lt Col Zygmunt Dabrowski, 1st Lt Edward Lewonski, Jozefa Sidor, Lt Col Mieczyslaw Maciuszkiewicz--these are self-sacrificing, devoted civil defense workers.

"The best is enemy to the good. In order not to stagnate, it is necessary to further expand the resources of the center's training base and to improve training methods," A. Loster will thus be saying in conclusion. To this end, a rotating council on methods, dedicated to questions regarding communication and alerts, will be organized. Also, the installation of a closed circuit instructional television in all the rooms, including the studio, will be carried out.

9275
CSO: 2600

POLAND

SURVEY ASSESSES IDEOLOGICAL ATTITUDES OF YOUTH

Warsaw RAZEM in Polish No 13, 26 Mar 78 pp 5-7

[Article by Kazimierz Wasiak: "Are Young Poles Ideologically Motivated"?]

[Text] For several years now the problem of ideological motivation, or rather the suspected lack thereof, in Poland's young generation has been a recurrent theme with the press. Contrary to popular belief, this issue is more often discussed in youth periodicals than in "adult" publications. This fact is, however, of marginal importance. On matters of substance, a considerable diversity of evaluation is observed.

There are those who, shocked by the uncritical following of Western lifestyles by some young people, are on the point of claiming that the entire young population is alien to ideology and socialism. They assert that it is an apolitical generation lacking a general social instinct and an ability to reflect on ideology.

Allowing themselves to be misled by the seemingly totally consumption-oriented approach to life, they accuse youth of conformism, mercantilist pragmatism and even hedonism. They fear that the young segment of the population, ideologically alienated, apathetic and insensitive to the intrinsic beauty of "higher" ideals and the attractiveness of collective forms of social and political life, steadily grows in number and has already become quite sizable.

In the confrontation of views expressed in the press, another group takes a directly opposite position. Citing in their support totally different manifestations of mentality, attitude and behavioral clues of the young generation of Poles, commentators from this group positively maintain that our young people are not only physically well-formed and intellectually efficient but equally well developed spiritually. They are hardworking, ready for sacrifice and for taking the correct stand in moments of crucial importance for the country and the nation. In other words, they are committed, that is, ideologically motivated.

Where does the truth lie? Is it somewhere in the middle, as usual? Or perhaps, in this case, the popular wisdom of this saying is not applicable? Perhaps the matter is more complex and realities are more intricate, hence the response cannot be unambiguous. Or else, perhaps everything depends on what is meant by ideology?

The need to resolve this--not yet dramatic but most certainly disconcerting--discrepancy of opinion seems to be subject to no doubt. The possibilities to do so are perhaps less obvious. Until now, no empirical research on the state of the ideological commitment among Polish youth has been undertaken in Poland. This, however, is the only method to settle the doubts that obsess adults and youth alike. In particular, there is a lack of direct field research. I have not come across a single study containing data on what ideals, evaluations, values and standards, whether purely ideological and political in character, are held by the young generation, nor whether any ideals of this kind are held at all.

In a pioneering attempt, the author of this article has channeled his interests to this intensely discussed problem. In the past, I was interested in the problem of consciousness among college students.

In the course of my investigations I observed that each individual, i.e., young person, possesses a single, fairly coherent conception of an ideal of social life. This image, a combination of several general beliefs constituting a subjective outlook toward "life," carries an invaluable practical advantage. It makes it easier for an individual or community to "find its way" in complex realities of social actuality. It prevents, among other things, human engagement in mutually exclusive actions.

My research goal was to comprehend the political consciousness of young workers.

In other words, I intended to probe their ideological profile. My choice of the community and research population was not accidental. Young workers represent an important sector of the working class and a substantial segment of youth community simultaneously. I investigated the problem using the Szczecin province population as my sample, and my result obviously supply only partial explanation of the state of ideological commitment among Polish youth.

My sample included 452 respondents, or 3.1 percent of the total number of young workers in Szczecin. They either resided and worked in the city of Szczecin (72 percent) or only worked there (20 percent) and resided in the towns and villages in the area. They were employed as manual workers directly on production lines, in transport or in construction. Major industry workers from Szczecin's maritime economy and industrial plans employing more than 2,000 persons constituted 29.1 percent of the respondents. Those classified as members of the traditional working class (from plants employing

fewer than 1,000 employees) represented 48.9 percent. A notable feature of the subjects was the short duration of their time in service--up to 6 years. Youth was of course their most important biopsychological characteristic--youth was defined as being between 18 to 28 years of age. The working class constituted the dominate category from which the subjects traced their origin. Worker origin was indicated by 79 percent, while 12 percent were of intelligentsia background (!). They represented a diversified and relatively high level of education: 49 percent had a primary vocational education or equivalent, and 42.5 percent were graduates of various secondary technical or secondary comprehensive schools. Their incomes were relatively varied, but high in the aggregate. Women made up 51 percent of those who filled the questionnaire.

Ideological commitment in young workers, though of major importance in the research on Polish youth, was not the sole topic of the study. The purpose of the survey--for this was the technique I employed--was to quantify the quality and status of ideological commitment among young workers, and to determine the basis of this phenomenon and its manifestations. In effect, I hope to find out to what extent the socialist orientation had already been consolidated in the mentality and attitudes of the young worker community.

I hope readers will excuse my omitting a more extensive description of the course of the study: those interested should see my book. Let me merely explain that I understood ideological commitment as the subjects' possession of so-called "higher," rather than private and pragmatic, political ideals. These ideals constitute partial, though essential, elements of the entire system of values, assessment and standards that are component parts of personality. Ideological commitment also includes appropriate readiness to be guided by ideals in daily life and the will to actually comply in everyday behavior with the standards derived from these ideals.

In an effort to fathom the level of ideological commitment among young workers, a number of questions were posed. While asking these questions, I relied on an elementary subconscious reflex which is usually present in attitudes. This is to say, people pin their faith on those virtues and political values which they consider close to their hearts and among which they feel safe. Opposite responses should be regarded as contrary to the logic of existence.

In light of the submitted verified responses, corroboration was provided to those views which say Poland is not suffering from a wide-scale crisis in ideological commitment among the young generation (at least as far as young workers in Szczecin are concerned). There is no reason to think that this is not the case with regard to other places. No arguments against this assumption are available.

Young workers' ideological awareness is distinctly focused on higher political ideals, e.g. interests which have the format of broader, pansocial,

national, state-, class- and stratum-related and international categories. These are categories of an ideological nature.

The phenomenon of ideological conflicts does not occur within the community investigated. The polled workers most frequently approve a system of ideals, concepts, values, standards and evaluations which, among us, are known as socialist. This approval is nearly universal in their community.

With the reader's permission, I will insert here to a table which provides a composite indicator of ideological commitment, uncomplicatingly presenting this complex and implicit phenomenon.

Table I

Objective Composition of Ideological Commitment Characteristic of Socialist Consciousness

	Extent Within Community in %
1. National consciousness--socialist patriotism	97.3
2. Internationalist consciousness	96.5
3. Ideological consciousness--socialist consciousness of the political system	94.0
4. Government consciousness--forms of socialist democracy	92.0
5. Class consciousness	84.2
6. Doctrinal consciousness--the functioning of people's rule	77.1

This table permits the formulation of an opinion regarding the kind of political thinking represented by the respondents, and consequently, the degree (extent) and direction of ideological commitment; the ideological aspirations of an overwhelming majority of the surveyed workers center on the socialist political system and on the higher social ideals given priority by this system. In other words, it can be said that in the respondents' consciousness it is easy to identify a strongly outlined and rather unambiguous ideological commitment.

Apprehensions concerning the lack of ideological commitment also occur, however, though only to a limited extent. This state of affairs is indicated by the lack of interest in political systemic problems and an emotional indifference toward ideological matters, exhibited by some respondents. If this indicator is accepted, it can be assumed that ideological indifference is shown by 4.1 percent of those surveyed. Moreover, nearly 1.5 percent regard political problems in a typically conformist fashion, evaluating different political systems through a filter of their own excessively conformist needs.

Even a cursory glance at this data indicates that, in the main, young workers are ideologically committed, and the direction of this commitment is toward socialist ideology, at least as far as their declared ideology is concerned.

This roughly sketched picture of ideological commitment among young people seems to suggest that in principle everything is fine.

I do not think, however, that one should be satisfied with these reassuring findings. This would ultimately be equivalent to conceding that all doubts concerning ideological commitment among youth are unfounded, slanderous and insinuating fabrications, targeted against the young generation. I am far from implying anything of this sort to anyone, and my intentions are completely different. As will be shown in subsequent discussion, definite and apparently not at all trifling reasons exist for a different view to be held.

Consequently, consideration should be given to the secret of the "hiatus" between ideological commitment as declared by young Poles and the absence of such commitment described by some commentators. As I hope to point out, the matter apparently centers on the fact that, first, we are dealing with differing interpretations of ideological commitment by various people and, second, ideological commitment in the young generation indeed differs to a certain extent from its traditional forms in character, especially if it is compared with the notions held by adult generations. It differs from what we routinely understand as ideological commitment. Youth understands these matters in a similar but not identical fashion. This differentiation varies in scale and directions it assumes.

Probably the best route to follow will be to present here those qualitatively novel elements which I discovered while scrutinizing the panorama of ideological commitment among young workers. In general, these new elements primarily include such features of ideological commitment as: much increased exercise of the intellect, a different distribution of emphasis, rearrangement of priorities and preferences on the individual/society interface, subconscious identification of socialism with humanism and communism with modernity, striving to egalitarianism (though nonanonymous, i.e. with a concurrent urge to manifest individual personality), the search for theatricalization of life, fascination with oneself, inclination for exuberant individualism with simultaneous appreciation of the advantage of collective action. Furthermore, the ideological consciousness of the polled sample is marked by continual pressure for expanding the range of ideology to include the concerns of the individual. The focus here is on extending ideology beyond general national concerns and allowing it to "descend" below class and group matters. Similar pressure is observed with regard to seemingly remote problems in environmental protection viewed in the urban, biological, or spatial perspective. Disproportions and contradictions come to the fore in the panorama of ideological commitment among young workers. The standards that have until now been relevant in this respect appear to be almost ignored.

Let us take a closer look at these differing manifestations of "novelty" in ideological commitment. Most striking is a certain modesty or restraint in the subjects' communicating their ideological attitudes to those around them. In this regard we are dealing with a fairly widespread dislike to open advertising of one's ideological commitment. In other words, this is ideological commitment camouflaged, as it were. The subjects abhor ostentatious ideological commitment.

Showing off of this kind is suspected by them to be opportunistic, self-promoting, conformist and even self-deceiving. It appears, however, that an attitude of excessively restrained and self-conscious disclosure of one's ideological commitment has certain disadvantages, aside from doubtless positive aspects. On the one hand, it prevents negative developments--turning one's attitude into a marketable product. On the other hand, infrequent and constrained expression of an ideological attitude can result in its atrophy (an unmanifested feeling fades away) and the rise of an undesirable impression that the ideological component is absent from interpersonal relationships. A trend of this kind is already operating: i.e. it is considered tactless in social contact to discuss topics that tie in with ideological commitment.

Aside from uncommunicativeness, the formation of an opinion about youth's ideological commitment is difficult because of [a certain symbolism], mandatory in the area of ideological information. The encoding of fundamental ideological values is conducted in discussions on political issues using either terminology transplanted from the vocabulary of ethics or substandard language characteristic for communities or peer groups: in fact, it could be called a kind of slang. The decoding of these symbols is difficult yet it constitutes a precondition for communicating with young people. Traditional expressions are often described as cliches, slogans, "snow job" and threadbare phraseology.

The cherishing of ideals in the young generation is also seen in the informality prevailing among youth, by which older persons are undoubtedly scandalized. Ostentation, bombastically proclaimed adherence to principles and pomposity--occasionally observed as forms of ideological emotions--are discredited in the youth community. Their preferred equivalents are frankness, ordinary behavior and unpretentiousness. Only behavior of this sort can be expected to be regarded as anything better than "putting on an act."

The investigated population manifests a critical disposition--essentially a constant feature of every young generation--in an untypical manner.

With a rather considerable lack of restraint, though without losing their sense of realities, the respondents pass valid judgment on important developments in political life. Without a trace of embarrassment or respect, customary in such cases, they rationally and critically analyze various myths and stereotypes which have evolved, in their opinion, in the practice

spelled out in labor contracts. Thus the problem originates in the sphere of social involvement outside of the job. The respondents frequently believe that an institutionalized system of inspection exists in society, and this system, rather than particular individuals, should effectively eliminate improprieties in the country's life. This is so because young people are convinced that the functional structure of the mechanisms of the socialist system is by its very nature efficient and productive. Accordingly, the sources of improprieties occurring in our social life should be sought in human failures, character faults, incompetence and lack of qualifications. The man in the street cannot be burdened with the overcoming of these negative phenomena. It is a task for the authorities. The youth unwillingly participate in activities of this sort since it does not see in them an opportunity to achieve, frequently registering its inability to cope with the improprieties occurring in the working and living environments.

Honest work and, to a greater extent, participation in social campaigns and social activism in organizations call for distinct compensation in the form of social recognition offered by communities and superiors.

Heroes of work do not want to be anonymous, operating on the principle of an "invisible hand." Enthusiasm for social work fades away if satisfaction is no longer fueled by recognition. The prevailing conceptual stereotype couples commitment with promotions and advancement, giving a consumption-oriented coloring to these notions. Collective success is a source of satisfaction and carries some importance only if it is a personal success at the same time.

A fairly widespread feature in the ideological consciousness of the surveyed youth population is their highly instrumental treatment of the political system and the state and the government apparatus as tools for realization of humanistic ideals and human needs. The line of departure for this approach is provided by a rather keen valuation of socialism. The higher value of this system finds its expression in the fact, among other things, that people can and should pose greater demands upon it: "Socialism is a system that is at the service of man." "It is not improper to remember about oneself when one talks about socialism." Among many reflections arising in this context, let us take note of only one. It is obvious to the respondents that within the system the overall goals of socialism can be harmonized with individual aspirations--an extremely valuable phenomenon. Yet against the background of the instrumental approach to systemic and governmental institutions, a sort of individual philosophy takes shape, expressed in refractory compliance with the social discipline and decisions of the authorities and social norms.

Despite everything the development of ideological consciousness in young persons proceeds spontaneously to a certain extent. As already mentioned, the panorama of their consciousness includes something on the order of delayed consciousness. This additionally complicates the intergenerational differences in interpreting ideological commitment. Consciousness at a forward stage is formed not only under the influence of social existence but

of social life. For persons with a conservative frame of mind, this can be equivalent to unceremonious questioning of the spiritual achievements of the adult generation, or even an ideological sacrilege. However, this issue loses its apparent acuteness if it is remembered that every young generation proclaims its credo against the background of iconoclastic assessments of realities around them. Because of their age, young people are not yet responsible for the shape of realities. For them, these are realities they just encountered, hence this lack of restraint in their evaluations. I admit that my impression is that something other than this normal critical disposition is involved in this case. It is a new outlook. The country's accelerated socioeconomic development results in a rapid development of consciousness (in general, it is usually somewhat delayed). Consequently, the young generation becomes a link with modernity by being the first to respond to and "get," without any historical ballast, the new ideas created by new social realities. In this particular case this alters the nature of ideological involvement from a pioneer-socialist type to an ordinary, or typically socialist, variety.

The international arena is an important level for the formation of ideological motivation among young workers. Domestic events, development, and processes are each time considered, evaluated and weighed against current world developments. The values, assessments and standards accepted by the respondents do not have an abstract, historically amorphous form, but in each case they represent references to the socialism/capitalism dilemma. Habitual confrontations of this kind result in further regression of the historical consciousness, so typical of Poles until recently. Their attachment to tradition appears to revert to the past and reemerge in cycles. Many socialist ideals are directly formulated on the basis of negative or positive results of comparisons of phenomena occurring in the West with what goes on in Poland. Many models are directly taken from the West, which is particularly true and visible with regard to political conduct. Attitudes are observed which are based on excessive expectation of incessant services on the part of society and on generally strong and asymmetrical emphasis placed on society's duties toward the individual, giving at the same time barely a hint of individual readiness for service to the motherland.

Certain reflections are induced by observations on patriotism. The respondents cultivate patriotism of the social and national kind with a somewhat idealistic ring. It still is not a fully contemporary variety of patriotism: concrete patriotism of consistent work for the prosperity of Poland and Poles. It must be admitted that the modern variety of patriotism is making headway, but its progress is too slow. Modern motives in patriotism are understood to mean efficient and quality performance measured in terms of fulfillment of production plans. The issue is self-evident in this case: only a good worker is a patriot. Yet criteria of good performance are varied; in any event, a great many so-called objective excuses are in operation. On the other hand, there is merely a faint outline of patriotism conceived as work for society that extends beyond the performance of duties

equally under the powerful impact of the socialist-model social ideals and prospects presented to the young generation. This is most noticeable in the sphere of aspirations. It is with aspirations, rather than with the actual role and position, that individuals identify themselves. Young people are to a greater extent that which they want to be rather than that which they are. This leads to depreciation of individual and national achievements, and dwelling instead of exceptional historical episodes. It also foments false images of the "omnipotence of authorities," and favors voluntaristic interpretation of decision making. On the other hand, this "advance consciousness" undoubtedly constitutes the new-generation ferment for the development of the nation. It represents rejection of complacency, unfounded optimism and self-satisfaction.

In sum, ideological consciousness in the surveyed youth segment shares some features with the consciousness of the adult community and possesses elements specific to this generation. Consequently, their ideological commitment is to a certain extent traditional but at the same time, in its own way, innovative--avant-garde. Therefore, even though the young generation's ideological consciousness is formed under the influence of the consciousness of older generations, it is not a simple extrapolation of that "paternal" consciousness. This innovativeness can be evaluated as a desirable rather than an inevitable phenomenon. Raising the level of socialist consciousness in society is out of the question unless there are qualitative, not only quantitative, changes in the expressions of this consciousness.

What other general reasons can be cited to explain the innovations revealed in the image of young workers' generation consciousness? In brief, it is undoubtedly a mirror image of internal generational problems of youth. Yet I do not think that these innovations can be reduced to the dimensions of ordinary transgenerational mutation. More than anything else, they result from personal experiences of members of the young generation, acquired in the environment in which this generation was born and raised, i.e., in the environment of socialism-building society. The respondents' ideological consciousness mirrors the road we have covered--it is the product and aftermath of the socialist conditions of living. On the other hand, in the face of world confrontation of the two systems, it signals, in a thoroughly modern fashion, the current problems which will require solutions in the future.

8795
CSO: 2600

ROMANIA

CEAUSESCU STAND ON FOREIGN POLICY HAILED BY CLUJ WEEKLY

Cluj TRIBUNA in Romanian 17 Aug 78 p 1

Article by Ioan Chis: "Ceausescu's Active, Responsible Foreign Policy"⁷

Text⁷ The speech we are discussing, with its pronounced impact upon domestic and international public opinion, is impressive primarily because of its high theoretical and scientific level and the progressive revolutionary spirit, morality and flexibility, and determined responsibility with which it approaches the new developments and trends of modern international affairs. The speech is accordingly a new proof of the high theoretical and creative capacity of our party's higher administration and of its secretary general, Nicolae Ceausescu, a notable personality of international politics and the communist and labor movement who, by virtue of his extensive and varied contacts with politicians of the most diverse persuasions in all countries and continents and his direct ties with their peoples, is best able to interpret the new trends and developments in the world and to recommend rational and just courses to follow.

The aggravated antagonism and intensified efforts to redivide the world into spheres of influence are one of the dangers threatening the international community today. To this end the great powers and international monopolies are resorting both to use of force, or military measures, and to economic measures. But the efforts to redivide the world into spheres of influence and domination are being more and more strongly opposed by a new policy of international collaboration based upon full equality of rights and the principles of national sovereignty and independence, noninterference in internal affairs and mutual benefit, which policy alone can secure a democratic evolution of international political affairs, relations of friendship and collaboration among all nations, and the consolidation of general security and peace. Elimination of underdevelopment, establishment of the new international economic and political order, disarmament, and democratized relations among states would be corollaries of this policy. As Nicolae Ceausescu pointed out in the speech under consideration, not much progress has so far been made with the problems of eliminating underdevelopment and building the new international order. The desire of the capitalist states to maintain their domination has become obvious. Yet some socialist countries have remained aloof from these efforts, on the ground that the problems of underdevelopment and of the new international economic order should be the concern of the countries that had colonies and are accordingly obligated

to contribute to their solution. But the RCP feels that the elimination of underdevelopment, construction of the new international order, and promotion of economic relations based on principles of full equality and justice are actually a direct continuation of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Hence also the revolutionary movement's vital need of complete unification with the struggle to eliminate underdevelopment and to construct the new international order. The socialist countries, the communist and labor parties including those in the developed capitalist countries, the revolutionary movement and all progressive democratic forces must actively support this effort entirely in keeping with the principle of international solidarity. In order to stimulate the effort to eliminate underdevelopment as one of the gravest problems of modern times, Romania recommends organizing a UN session on the subject of the new international order. This session first requires agreement among the developing states on a program and a clear policy on this subject, and it must be prepared by a UN Commission to draft the appropriate documents on the principles, policies and means of eliminating underdevelopment and establishing the new international order.

The speech took up a whole series of new problems in connection with the situation in the socialist countries, pointing out that on the whole all the socialist countries have made good progress in their economic development and in constructing their new social system. Yet even the socialist countries are having their difficulties in their socioeconomic development, such as the decline of the growth rate and national income in some countries, the impossibility of meeting consumer needs, especially for food products and imported agricultural food products, etc. As regards some problems that have arisen between socialist countries such as those between the USSR and China and the fact that new and divisive problems have developed between Cambodia and Vietnam, between China and Vietnam, between China and Albania, etc., our party can but regret this deterioration of the relations between the respective socialist countries and express its hope that these states and the respective parties will make every effort to remedy it as soon as possible. It is their duty to act in the spirit of mutual respect, national sovereignty and independence, full equality of rights and the principles of socialism in order to settle their difficulties by direct negotiation. In this connection, our party will make every effort toward the resolution by discussion and negotiation of any problem involving disagreements with other parties or socialist states, for the sake of greater solidarity and unity. In keeping with the decisions of the 10th Party Conference as confirmed by the 11th Party Congress and the National Party Conference, Romania is developing its good relations with all socialist states and will not permit itself to become involved in any way in public polemics or in censuring any one of the socialist countries. On the contrary, it will do all it can to settle the differences and to strengthen their solidarity.

Nicolae Ceausescu's speech included a pertinent analysis of the new developments in the international communist and labor movement, noting as a favorable trend the more intensive development of the independent policies of the various communist and labor parties since the Berlin Conference, and the widespread assertion of the principles of equality and mutual respect in the relations among these parties. On the other hand, tendencies to interfere in the affairs of communist and labor parties have still continued. The communist and labor

parties in Europe and other continents have consolidated their positions and are playing a greater role and exerting more influence on both the national and international levels, thanks to their choice of independent policies based on the national realities in their respective countries. Therefore all efforts must be made from now on to emphatically assert these principles in relations within the communist and labor movement and to observe every party's right to develop its revolutionary policy, strategy and tactics independently according to the conditions in its country and with no outside interference. Promotion of an independent national policy does not and should not conflict with the solidarity of these parties or the struggle for democracy, socialism and peace.

The term "Eurocommunism," used more and more often by the communist parties in the West, is to be taken as an expression of the respective parties' desire to promote just such an independent policy and to fight the revolutionary battle in accordance with the conditions in their countries and the interests of the great majority of their peoples. But the fact that some parties oppose a model of socialist construction, and it is their right to do so, does not justify the claim to develop another model binding on the others. We must realize that socialist reform has to be based on facts and not on patterns. No kind of name can change the revolutionary conception of the development of human society.

Some parties' rejection of the concept of Marxism-Leninism, replacing it with "true Marxism-Leninism" etc., is to be regarded in the same light. It is every party's right to choose its name and to style itself as it sees fit. In the long run it is not vital whether some party calls itself "Marxist-Leninist" or "true Marxist-Leninst." What counts is the emphasis that is placed upon the scientific content of the revolutionary theory upon which a party's activity is based, or the correctness of its orientation in the revolutionary struggle in conformity with the fundamental principles of socialism and with the requirements of experience.

Nicolae Ceausescu's speech, which condenses a great wealth of ideas and lessons to which we can refer here only in part, concluded on an optimistic note as to the evolution of the present international situation: "It can be said that scientific, dialectical-materialist analysis of the worldwide phenomena and trends of today demonstrates real prospects of a favorable evolution of international affairs and an increasing assertion of the peoples' will to live in a world of peace and collaboration and to develop and cooperate in freedom on the path of socioeconomic progress, prosperity and civilization. Although there are now serious contradictions, discord and conflicts in international affairs, and though alongside the increasing advance of the peoples' struggles for freedom, independence and progress we also see moments of retreat and weakening of this struggle, on the whole it can be said that the general trend is favorable. The ideas of socialism, independence and progress are gaining more and more strength despite the difficulties and the efforts of the backward forces to check the course of history. And so we are convinced that we can view the future with complete confidence. The peoples, the true creators of history, have forces and the capacity to overcome any difficulties or obstacles and to build on our planet a better and more just world, a world of peace and collaboration."

ROMANIA

DISPUTE OVER STATUS OF BESSARABIA IN 1878 RECALLED

Bucharest ANALE DE ISTORIE in Romanian No 4, Jul-Aug 78 pp 37-50

/Article by Vasile Maciu/

/Text/ The Berlin Congress of 1878 is of special interest in the history of the Romanian people since, through it, the big powers recognized Romania's independence, which had been proclaimed a year before, and because this European political forum gave back to our country Dobrogea, the old Romanian territory snatched from Wallachia by the Ottoman Empire in the second decade of the 15th century. It also has a negative aspect created by the spirit of domination of the main big powers, consisting of a painful amputation of national territory as well as imposing a change in the country's constitution, something that could have been left to its social-political forces.

Although of special importance, Romania's position on the action of calling the congress and the work of the Berlin Congress on the situation created for our country following a war in which it had participated with much bloody and material sacrifice was not studied especially as a problem of the history of the Romanian people but merely in broad works and studies. Titu Maiorescu viewed it in a polemical way from the viewpoint of the Junimist conservative grouping, just as Frederic Dame², influenced by the conservative line, also did. Belonging to a new generation, N. Iorga presented it in his works entitled "King Carol's Foreign Policy" (Bucharest 1916), "The War for Romania's Independence--Diplomatic Actions and States of Spirit" (Bucharest 1927) and "The History of the Romanians"³ as a painful matter without, however, researching it comprehensively in a special work. Answering a need of Romanian foreign policy of his time, G. I. Bratianu wrote a brochure entitled "Le Probleme des Frontieres Russo-Roumaines Pendant la Guerre de 1877-1878 et au Congres de Berlin" in 1928. From an objective viewpoint, Romania's position toward the Berlin Congress was presented by the British historian R. W. Seton-Watson⁴ in a work which

appeared in 1937 and in 1965 the author of this article⁵ attempted to give a dialectical interpretation.

On the eve of the 1877-1878 war, Romania was a state with full autonomy guaranteed by the seven powers who signed the Paris Treaty of 1856, but under the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire, to whom it paid tribute. The attempts it made in the summer of 1876 to obtain absolute political independence with the agreement of the majority of the big European powers did not succeed, with both England, defender of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, as well as tsarist Russia, who intended to take southwestern Bessarabia, actually Moldavia, in 1856 through the decisions of the Paris Congress being opposed to this. Romania's demand made to the Constantinople Conference of December 1876-January 1877 of the seven European powers to give it political status "through a special guarantee of its perpetual neutrality" and, in case of war of one of the big powers with the Porte, to give it "a special guarantee for respect for its rights and its neutrality and integrity" was not accepted for discussion by the conference.⁶

With its claims not being taken into consideration by the big powers, Romania concluded a convention with Russia on 4 April 1877 by which it ensured its political existence and territorial integrity;⁷ at the same time free passage was given to the Russian armies through the country against the Ottoman Empire. With the Turks attacking the Romanian cities on the Danube, the Romanians also bombarded Vidin, a Turkish fortress and on 29 April the meeting of deputies voted a motion which declared a state of war between Romania and the Ottoman Empire and demanded that the government "place all its diligence and take all measures in order to defend and ensure the existence of the Romanian state so that with the coming peace Romania would come out with a well-defined position and the independent nation could fulfill its historic mission."⁸ As Ion C. Bratianu, president of the Council of Ministers stated, the guarantee of independence must "be sought first of all in us ourselves."⁹ As a result of the motion voted on 9 May 1877, the legislative bodies voted a new motion by which Romania's absolute independence was proclaimed.¹⁰

On 2 May, M. Kogalniceanu, minister of foreign affairs, pointed out to the guarantor powers the need Romania had to defend itself against the Ottoman aggression, asserting that the Romanians were counting on their understanding for the situation created.¹¹ Some 20 days later, he sent a note to Romania's diplomatic agents in the guarantor powers, showing the circumstances in which Romania had proclaimed its total independence.¹² Not one of the guarantor powers hurried to approve Romania's decision to become an independent state. Russia recognized Romania's independence

as a fact but not as a right, as Chancellor Gorchakov stated to Lord Loftus, the British ambassador in St. Petersburg. The Russian chancellor stated, "It is a matter which should only be treated later by all the European powers. His highness, he added, draws the attention of the British ambassador to the fact that the Austrian Government expressed the same opinion as he."¹³ In this way, even in May 1877 Gorchakov put into perspective the convocation of a congress of the seven powers which had signed the Treaty of Paris, which showed that he was not convinced that the war could be concluded with a bilateral Russian-Turkish peace.

When the war to which all the Romanian people made their full contribution was nearing the end, Romania's Council of Ministers on 2 January 1878 decided to send Col Eracle Arion to Kazanlik to deal with "the conditions of the armistice and preliminaries of peace between Romania and the Ottoman Empire" with the Porte delegations. The end of M. Kogalniceanu's report, accepted by the Council of Ministers, pointed out to the Romanian delegate that "in the case where Romania's participation in the negotiations of the armistice and those of peace is not permitted, the Romanian delegate will state that he will consider any act which concerns us and in which we do not participate as null and void."¹⁴ However, the Romanian delegate was not received by the command of the Russian Army at the armistice and peace treaties. Al. I. Nelidov, director of the Diplomatic Office of the Grand Headquarters of the Imperial Army, notified the Romanian prime minister by telegraph to send to St. Petersburg his views on the bases for peace.¹⁵

Shortly after this, on 14 January 1878, General Ghica, the Romanian diplomatic agent in St. Petersburg, reported that the tsar and the chancellor had formally informed him of "their intention to take back the portion of Bessarabia up to Chilia. The arguments raised, General Ghica continued, referred to the fact that this portion of Bessarabia was reunited with Moldavia and not with Romania through the decisions of a treaty "of which nothing more remains."¹⁶ General Ghica answered that the territory demanded "is a piece of our body" and the act of 1856 was made unconditionally, but the tsar and the chancellor kept their position. Asked whether this matter would be resolved "through a congress or a direct understanding with Romania," they answered that they were for "an understanding with the country," for which purpose General Ignatyev would come to Bucharest.¹⁷

In Vienna the tsarist embassy asserted that this matter was arranged between the Romanian and Russian governments,¹⁸ but M. Kogalniceanu informed I. Balaceanu, Romania's diplomatic agent in Vienna, that he had known "what had taken place in the Reichstadt" even from July 1877 and that he did not "need to ask

Prince Gorchakov if Austro-Hungary had agreed to the retrocession of Bessarabia or not." M. Kogalniceanu drew I. Balaceanu's attention to the fact that "the understanding is made between Vienna and St. Petersburg and not between the St. Petersburg and Bucharest cabinets." Telling I. Balaceanu that not one line came from his ministry "without being discussed and approved by the council president," M. Kogalniceanu stated categorically: "We will not barter with the land of our country."¹⁹

On 19 January General Ignatyev, who had arrived the previous day in Bucharest, had a meeting with I. C. Bratianu and M. Kogalniceanu.²⁰ He openly claimed southwestern Bessarabia. M. Kogalniceanu informed General Ghica: "The prince (Carol I) and the government answered that this territory, having been given back to us by Europe and our territorial integrity being guaranteed by the 4 April 1877 Convention, we could not agree to the demand for retrocession and that the big powers have the right to come out on this matter."²¹ The faith in "Europe" was based on the opinion that England and Austro-Hungary would oppose the Russian demands up to the end. Proceeding from a similar conviction, Chancellor Gorchakov later stated that he did not accept Romania's thesis that "Europe" alone, that is, a congress of the big powers, had the right to resolve the problem and, as a result, he stated to General Ghica that this "is not in the competence of the big powers of Europe as well as many others which England represents."²²

Knowledge of the tsarist government's claims caused strong anxiety in Romania. At the 26 January 1878 meeting of the meeting of deputies, historian V. A. Urechia, professor at the University of Bucharest, made an appeal, begging the government "to please tell us what faith we should place in the threatening noises being spread more and more strongly in the journals in Romania and abroad."²³ Answering him. I. C. Bratianu, president of the Council of Ministers, stated that Russia had not "formally" informed the Romanian Government "regarding the cession of Bessarabia" but had categorically stated its intention, "however, only informally," "to take back our portion of Bessarabia," to which "our reply was that the Romanian nation never would agree either to cession or even to changing a portion of its territory, even if it were with the most advantageous compensation (applause)"²⁴ Deputy G. Vernescu then made a motion which, recalling the guarantee of the big powers and Article 2 of the Romanian-Russian Convention of 4 April 1877, stressed the great material and blood sacrifices made by the country in the war "to keep its integrity and to consolidate its independence" and he concluded with the statement that the meeting "is decisive on keeping the country's territorial integrity and does not permit estrangement of its land under any name and for any

territorial compensation or damages." Put to a vote, the motion was approved by all deputies present.²⁵ The senate voted on a similar motion. The vote of the legislative bodies was sent by a circulating telegram to Romania's diplomatic agents abroad.²⁶

Meanwhile, Austro-Hungary, convinced that tsarist Russia would not agree to cede Bosnia and Herzegovina as had been arranged by the Budapest Convention of January-March 1877, invited the European powers to the conference in Vienna to regulate the situation created by the military defeat of the Ottoman Empire. For calling such a conference, M. Kogalniceanu asked that Romania's diplomatic agent in Vienna insist to Count Andrassy "that Romania should have a special representative at the conference, without whom nothing can be decided concerning it. It should also be right," he added, "that the conference consider us, even from its first meeting, as forming an absolutely independent state."²⁷

In order to hinder an armed conflict in which it would have had to intervene alongside Austro-Hungary, Germany channeled the disputes in such a way that the conference was delayed and later changed into the Berlin Congress. In order to reach this result, Germany's Chancellor Bismarck appeared in the position of an interpellator in the Reichstag on 7 February 1878 regarding "the political situation in the east and the attitude taken and which will be taken by the government of the German empire."²⁸ Answering the interpellator, Bismarck stated that Germany did not have to take "the role of the judge of peace" but rather that it itself wanted to have a more modest role--"I would say more a role of an honest intermediary which really wants to take the business to a good conclusion."²⁹

Meanwhile, the maneuvers to convene the conference were continuing, headed by Andrassy, the Austro-Hungarian minister of foreign affairs. In order to use Romania against Russia, he made it known to M. Kogalniceanu, through the intermediary of I. Bala-ceanu, that "there is not one word of truth in the supposed promise given by Austro-Hungary to the Reichstadt regarding the retrocession of Bessarabia."³⁰ However, M. Kogalniceanu sought for Romania to be represented at the conference with the aid of Russia itself, if in no other way. For this purpose on 3 February he notified General Ghica that Romania wanted Russia to initiate a proposal "which would tend to state that admitting a Romanian representative to the coming conference was equitable and opportune."³¹ Admitting Romania to the conference as an independent state with a deliberative vote could hinder Russia's claims, for which reason Girs, who was Gorchakov's deputy, made it known on 14 February that Romania's independence "would be sanctioned by the conference; the chancellor prince does not

object to Romania's sending a delegation to the conference in a consultative status; with regard to admitting our country," General Ghica reported, "with a deliberative vote, the prince can neither take the initiative nor aid us, bearing in mind that such a proposal has no chance of being agreed upon by the powers."³²

Five days later--on 19 February 1878--the preliminary peace between Russia and the Ottoman Empire was signed in San Stefano. The preliminaries provided in Article 5 that the Porte "recognize Romania's independence,"³³ but in Article 18 that Russia agreed to replace "the payment of a large portion of the amounts enumerated in the paragraph with the cession of the following territories: a) Sandgeac Tulcea, that is, the districts (kazal) of Chilia, Sulina, Mahmudia, Isaccea, Tulcea, Macin, Babadag, Hirsova, Kustendje (Constanta) and Medgidia together with the islands of the delta and Island of the Snakes," territories for which "Russia keeps its power to exchange them with the portion of Bessarabia detached in 1856 and bordered on the south with the thalweg of the branch of the Chilia and Gura Stari-Stambul."³⁴ Article 8, indirectly referring to Romania, provided that "the Russian occupation troops in Bulgaria will maintain communications through Romania, but also through the ports of the Black Sea."³⁵

Knowledge of the provisions of the peace preliminaries of San Stefano caused displeasure in Romania, since they imposed ceding a portion of Romania's territory in exchange for an old Romanian territory snatched from Wallachia in the second decade of the 15th century by the Ottoman Empire. Under these circumstances, the Romanian Government sought to obtain Germany's aid to defend its views but, on 26 February, Romania's diplomatic agent in Berlin reported that Bulow, the German secretary in the ministry of foreign affairs, told him that "he thought it would be hard for Germany to oppose the wish of a large state like Russia, particularly if the other powers agreed on the retrocession of Bessarabia, which he seemed to feel was nearly certain."³⁶ Romania's interventions against the territorial clause in the San Stefano preliminaries angered Gorchakov very much, because "they tend to drag the emperor to the crossbar of Europe." He said that he would not present this matter to the congress and, if needed, it would occupy the territory demanded with arms.³⁷

In order to obtain the results he was seeking, Gorchakov supported convening a congress composed of the foreign ministers of the seven powers and not a conference as Austro-Hungary had proposed earlier. In order to be successful, he even rejected his desire to preside over the congress.³⁸ On 23 February, Romania's diplomatic agent in St. Petersburg reported that instead of the planned conference a congress would take place which

would meet in Berlin with Bismarck as its president as Andrassy had demanded on the eve of it.³⁹

In connection with the rumor that Greece would be admitted to the congress, I. Balaceanu telegraphed from Vienna on 1 March, pointing out that he had the assurance that if England made such a proposal, "Austro-Hungary would demand that Romania also be admitted."⁴⁰ In order to have a possible ally in this, Andrassy stated to I. Balaceanu that he did not accept Gorchakov's opinion on the matter of Bessarabia although even in 1876 he had agreed in the Reichstadt that this Romanian territory should be taken by Russia. He said this matter was one "of the ones which Europe is called upon to come out for" and he "openly" seemed to favor Romania's admittance to the congress and felt "that the other powers would not show any opposition." Yet he felt that Romania would not be admitted "with the same title as the signers of the Treaty of Paris" but that the congress doors would open to them as soon as its independence was recognized, "which should not be delayed." Andrassy, I. Balaceanu reported in continuation, "sees our independence as a matter of the first order for Austria which will defend it on any occasion but it wants it to be a real independence,"⁴¹ that is, without the neutrality guaranteed by the big powers.

Fighting Andrassy's opinion that Romania could be admitted to the congress only after recognition of its independence, M. Kogalniceanu telegraphed the Romanian diplomatic agent in Berlin on 13 March that he should not easily accept "the theory that perhaps we will not be admitted to the congress prior to recognition of our independence." The old capitulations "recognized in the Treaty of Paris" (1856) gave us the right to make war and peace and to conclude treaties. If the Convention of Paris (1858) did not recognize these rights for us, "this does not mean that they can dispose of us without us." M. Kogalniceanu continued, "We do not demand to be admitted to the congress as a big power signing the Treaty of Paris but as a state at whose expense it would not be possible to negotiate without its participation. Arguing in this way we maintain that the Treaty of San Stefano," the Romanian diplomat stressed, "is without value for us being drawn up without us and in order to demonstrate that the most of the articles of this act relate directly or indirectly to Romania and touch our interests, we demand to be admitted to the congress from the first day it meets."⁴² Three days later, M. Kogalniceanu sent a circulating note to Romania's diplomatic agents abroad with a similar content but more developed.⁴³ Among his new arguments was the country's participation in war. He wrote: "Romania took part in the war of 1877-1878, a part which was among the most active and honorable; it brought remarkable service to the military task sought jointly. Throughout the war, it had the role of an allied state

which was official and well known for which it did not spare anything to fulfill honestly."⁴⁴

An interpellator in the meeting of deputies on 15 March regarding the government attitude toward the treaty of San Stefano, the minister of foreign affairs answered that this treaty "touches the rights and interests of our country," that "the clause on war compensations is illusory and without sanction and it would be impossible for us to allow passage of the Russian Army through Romania during the occupation of Bulgaria, which has its ports on the sea and on the Danube."⁴⁵

The firm attitude of the Romanian Government is founded on the opinion that Austro-Hungary and England would decisively oppose congress acceptance of the San Stefano preliminaries, an opinion supported also by their opposition position which the British Government took, whose foreign minister "sent a circular to the offices," I. Balaceanu reported on 31 March 1878, "which explained the reasons why England could not accept the San Stefano Treaty." Among the stipulations which "Russia's sovereign will" would impose "on the Black Sea and the neighboring countries, he (Salisbury) quotes an article referring to Bessarabia."⁴⁶

The third week of March I. C. Bratianu went to Vienna and Berlin to find out to what extent Romania could be aided by Austro-Hungary and Germany. On 23 March he was received by Emperor Franz Joseph and, of course, also had meetings with Andrassy, who "decisively urged him to resist."⁴⁸ On 27 March he was received by Chancellor Bismarck in Berlin. The German Government, however, "was very reserved on the Bessarabia matter." Bismarck urged I. C. Bratianu to be favorably inclined to Russia's proposals since in this way "it would be possible to ask for a lot and to receive a lot from Russia--a hundred million and even larger territorial compensations."⁴⁹ On 3 April the president of the Council of Ministers returned to Bucharest from Berlin⁵⁰ at a time when the relations with Russia had worsened and powerful armed pressure from the tsarist government existed. Related to the Russian military actions, an interpellation was made on 5 April in the meeting of deputies to which I. C. Bratianu had to reply.⁵¹ The legislative bodies wanted the government moved to Craiova,⁵² the president of the Council of Ministers, fearing aggression, also came out for withdrawing the government to Oltenia, while Carol I and M. Kogalniceanu were opposed.⁵³ Yet on 20 April the Council of Ministers decided that the army "should take up defense positions in the Carpathians, between Pitesti, Cimpulung and Tigraviste."⁵⁴ On 29 April Carol I himself left for Oltenia,⁵⁵ returning to Bucharest in the second half of May.

The sequence of events caused by the peace preliminaries of San

Stefano, however, soon changed following the secret treaties mediated by Bismarck between England and Russia and between Austro-Hungary and Russia, with the latter making important concessions to the others. The danger of a new war was eliminated and the congress could be convened in Berlin. On 22 May Prince Hohenlohe, Germany's ambassador in Paris, informed France's minister of foreign affairs that, on Austro-Hungary's initiative, Germany's government was proposing to the powers which signed the 1856 and 1871 treaties "that they be favorably inclined to meet in Berlin for the congress in order to discuss the stipulations of the preliminary treaty of San Stefano concluded between Russia and Turkey," with the date for the opening of the congress being 1 June 1878.⁵⁶ Regarding convocation of it, even on 15 May M. Kogalniceanu informed the Romanian diplomatic agent in Paris (on a mission in London) that the probable meeting of the congress was communicated to him by the agent in Berlin. And the Romanian minister added: "No matter what the result is, peace or war, we Romanians, we have to defend our country's interests to the end." He added the detail that Austro-Hungary seemed very reserved toward Romania and that several Austro-Hungarian regiments had approached the Romanian borders while Russia, for its part, "was taking strategic dispositions."⁵⁷

Yet the concern caused by these military movements began to weaken as the meeting of the congress neared and, together with it, the hope that Romania's participation in the congress would be permitted. Opening of this way was made by the British Government, as the Romanian diplomatic agent in Paris (on a mission in London) reported on 26 May, pointing out that British foreign minister Salisbury had sent him a letter in which he informed him that his government was not opposed "to sending to Berlin proxies or delegates who would explain Romania's views and wishes to the congress on a consultative basis," adding, however, that with regard to Bessarabia (he had had an understanding about it with Suvalov, the Russian ambassador in London) "it is impossible for him to order the policy it would follow until he knew precisely what the other powers had in mind."⁵⁸

With a view to Romania's participation in the work of the congress, on 22 May M. Kogalniceanu sent his instructions to the Romanian diplomatic agents abroad, asking them to take "urgent steps for our admittance to this meeting" and to strive at the same time for Romania's independence to be recognized even at the first meeting.⁵⁹ Four days later, Virnav-Liteanu, the Romanian diplomatic agent in Berlin, telegraphed Bucharest that he was assured by Germany's foreign minister and by ambassadors that the Romanian delegates would be heard in the congress,⁶⁰ but he did not say whether Romania's independence also would be recognized on the first day, as the Romanian Government demanded.⁶¹

Through its 26 May journal, the Council of Ministers empowered Ion C. Bratianu, president of the Council of Ministers, and M. Kogalniceanu, foreign minister, to represent Romania "before the congress to defend the rights and interests of the Nation in conformity with the votes of the legislative bodies."⁶² Having arrived in Berlin, the Romanian plenipotentiaries as they were called requested from the plenipotentiaries of the big powers on 1 June, the day the congress opened, that they be "admitted to the congress to express and defend the rights of their country."⁶³ The congress did not hurry to convene or to immediately satisfy Romania's claims.

We know in part the activity of the two plenipotentiaries during their stay in Berlin from the reports sent by M. Kogalniceanu to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bucharest, as had been agreed when he left. He wrote on 9 June: "The first days were devoted to the customary visits."⁶⁴ In turn they met with Bulow, von Radowitz, one of the two secretaries of the congress, with Gor-chakov, Jomini (secretary of the Russian chancellor), Andrassy, Corti (Italy's foreign minister), Waddington (France's foreign minister), with Nothomb (Belgium's minister in Berlin) and with the Ottoman plenipotentiaries. Lord Beaconsfield, the British prime minister, and Salisbury, England's foreign minister, M. Kogalniceanu reported, "seem to be avoiding receiving us up until now," although the overburdened place with occupations "is not enough to explain such a persistent reserve."⁶⁵ The reserve of the British plenipotentiaries could be explained--what M. Kogalniceanu did not want to do--by their embarrassment at talking with the Romanian delegations following the unmasking of the arrangements made by England earlier with Russia by THE GLOBE. Above all, M. Kogalniceanu noted, we received assurances of sympathy, but they are purely academic and "show only a platonic and, therefore, sterile good will." Only Waddington was "on practical ground." However this was so they would not hope too much. He told them: "Bessarabia should be seen as lost." The congress, M. Kogalniceanu continued, held three sessions, but still did not answer the demand of the Romanian plenipotentiaries that Romania be admitted to its work. However, it decided "that Greece should be heard but not listened to on the matters concerning it."⁶⁷ Differences persist between England and Russia, despite all the arrangements published by THE GLOBE.⁶⁸ Information also is given that Bismarck, "faithful to the role and qualification of honest intermediary which he himself had given them, intervenes everywhere but without reaching a precise solution"⁶⁹ (which does not correspond to the facts--our note). Yet the congress will not fail since all the powers want peace and Germany wants it, since it has the need of combatting and diminishing socialism," as the able diplomat wants us to believe, we add. In this way, peace will be made "but to the detriment of the poor states, particularly Romania." The report concludes by mentioning that the two Romanian representatives were preparing a "Memorandum" to present to the congress when the time was right.⁷⁰

Several days later, on 12 June, with the "Memorandum" drawn up, the Romanian plenipotentiaries sent it to Bismarck, president of the congress, again formulating "the hope that a decision with regard to Romania will not be taken" before it is heard.⁷¹ The signers of the "Memorandum" showed that it "summarizes the points which Romania requests"⁷² to be adopted by Europe. Five demands were formulated in the "Memorandum": "1. No portion of the current territory should be detached from Romania. 2. The Romanian land should not be subjected to a right of passage for the profit of the Russian armies. 3. The principality, by virtue of its centuries-old titles, should reenter into the possession of the Danube islands and mouths, including the Island of the Snakes. 4. In proportion to the military forces it sends to battle, it should receive compensation in a form felt to be the most useful. 5. Its independence should receive final sanction and its territory (Romania's) should be declared neutral."⁷³

Waiting to be invited to support their country's cause, the Romanian plenipotentiaries on 18 June informed the ad interim minister of foreign affairs that the congress members they had visited up until then had "clearly" told them that Bessarabia was being sacrificed. In the last visits, Andrassy called them two times in a row, confirming this news, and asked them to submit to the congress decisions. In this case, he said, the congress would ensure Romania "territorial and political advantages which were larger than those stipulated in the San Stefano Treaty," but for recognition of independence Romania, just like Serbia, would be required to eliminate political and civil inequality on the basis of religion.⁷⁴ The same day, the Romanian plenipotentiaries announced in a verbal note from Bismarck that the congress had decided that evening to hear them at the 19 June meeting at 2 p.m.⁷⁵

The congress discussed the Romanian problem in two sessions; at the first one on 17 June, after the delegates from Greece had been heard, Lord Salisbury proposed that it be decided whether Romania's representatives would be heard by the congress. In his opinion, the high meeting, "after he has listened to the delegates of a nation claiming foreign provinces, would act equitably to hear the representatives of a country which asks that its territories be kept." Corti, the Italian representative, immediately went along with the opinion of his British colleague. Inclined more to oppose the reception of the Romanian delegates whose claims "do not seem to be able to facilitate good understanding," Bismarck still allowed it to be put to a vote by his colleagues since the matter had been raised.⁷⁶ Put to a vote, Salisbury's proposal was accepted by Andrassy, by Waddington, with the votes of the British representative and Corti having been given beforehand; Gorchakov stated that "the

presence of the Romanian representatives can cause lively discussion," but he did not vote against admitting them. Bismarck, asking for a precise vote of the Russian plenipotentiaries, the count Suvalov, said that "the observations of the Romanian delegates can only increase the difficulties of the discussion, since Russia certainly will not allow you to be accused by them without defending itself." Yet, he added, since the majority of the congress came out for admitting them, the Russian plenipotentiaries could not want removal of the contradictory elements and do not oppose Lord Salisbury's proposal. Andrassy, with the agreement of the entire meeting, then proposed that the Romanian delegates "be heard under the same conditions as the Greek ministers." The president of the congress announced that he would invite the Romanian representatives to the next meeting.⁷⁷

Continuing, they moved to a discussion of the articles of the San Stefano Treaty regarding Romania. Bismarck began by asking whether independence was being maintained without conditions or whether it should be subordinate "to Romania's acceptance of the territorial reshuffling which it seems to reject."⁷⁸ Corti came out against placing conditions on Romania's independence "of its adhering to the stipulations concerning it." Suvalov claimed that, although Romania proclaimed itself independent, its independence "cannot be effective without the agreement of Europe." Lord Beaconsfield stated that "he saw most regrettably that the stipulations of Article XIX of the San Stefano Treaty regarding Bessarabia" were contrary to the Treaty of Paris of 1856.⁷⁹ He added, however, that since the other signers of the Treaty of Paris had not intervened in this affair, he "could not advise the government of the queen to use force in order to maintain the stipulations of the Treaty (of Paris), but he protests this change."⁸⁰ Gorchakov supported the stipulations of the San Stefano Treaty on the territorial exchange imposed on Romania, stating that in 1856 Bessarabia had been given only to Moldavia, when the principalities were separate. He hoped, he continued, that Lord Beaconsfield "would not persist in his objections when His Excellency would recognize that the freedom of the Danube would not suffer in any way by the retrocession of Bessarabia."⁸¹ Suvalov, finding the chancellor's argument weak, completed it, saying that the problem of Bessarabia for Russia was being reduced to a "matter of honor." Speaking again, Gorchakov insisted on "the advantages" Romania would obtain with the exchange of the ceded territory.⁸² Interrupting the discussion, Bismarck said that, with regard to ensuring freedom of navigation on the Danube, "he agrees with the representatives of England, but finds no connection between the freedom of the Danube and the retrocession of Bessarabia." He then proposed "that continuation of the discussion be postponed until the Romanian representatives are heard in next Monday's meeting."⁸³

On the morning that the Romanian delegates were to be received in the congress, M. Kogalniceanu was invited by Bulow, with whom he had "a long talk." Certainly the German minister tried to convince his Romanian colleague of the need to accept the eventual congress decisions. Then, both Romanian delegates were received by Lord Beaconsfield, who, following the Romanian delegates' report, confined himself to carefully listening to them, after which he told them "that often in politics ingratitude is the price of the best services."⁸⁴ R. W. Seton-Watson, the British historian, provided a more comprehensive version of Lord Beaconsfield's words. Beaconsfield, he writes, received the two delegates, "listened to them courteously without expressing any opinion and warned them that 'in politics ingratitude is often the payment for the greatest services.'"⁸⁵

On 19 June 1878 at 2:30 p.m. the Romanian delegates were received in the congress meeting, just as the representatives of Greece had been.⁸⁶ The president invited them to express "the reports with which they have been entrusted."⁸⁷ M. Kogalniceanu spoke first, drawing attention to the fact that "the period of treaties was less useful to us than the luck of weapons."⁸⁸ Then summarizing the "Memorandum" presented to the congress on 12 June, he mentioned the provisions of the Romanian-Russian Convention of 4 April 1877, in which Russia guaranteed Romania's territorial integrity and demanded that Romania not be subject "to a right of passage as long as the occupation of Russian armies in Bulgaria lasts."⁸⁹ Romania "should reenter into possession of the islands and mouths of the Danube, including the Island of the Snakes."⁹⁰ It should be given war compensations in proportion with its military contingent; it should have its independence recognized and be given "a real guarantee of its neutrality."⁹¹ A short speech by Ion C. Bratianu followed in which he stated that "stripping us of a portion of our heritage would not only be a deep hurt for the Romanian nation but would destroy in it any faith in the strength of treaties and with it guard over the principles of absolute justice as well as written rights."⁹² After the president stated that "the congress will conscientiously examine the observations presented by the Romanian delegation,"⁹³ he withdrew.

Basing himself on the theory that "Europe alone has the right to sanction the independence" of Romania, Bismarck then asked the congress under what conditions it would make "this important decision,"⁹⁴ to which question Waddington, who obviously had an understanding with Bismarck and the other plenipotentiaries, proposed that Romania's independence should be subject to the same conditions placed on Serbia's independence,⁹⁵ that is, the provision that political and civil rights should not made a condition of religious cult. Bismarck, Beaconsfield and Corti

immediately associated themselves with the French proposal. Suvalov, however, also demanded placing the condition of independence on fulfilling the territorial demands of the Russian government.⁹⁶ Agreeing to satisfy these claims, Waddington asserted that the French delegates felt that "the Romanians have been treated rather harshly."⁹⁷ Waddington, Andrassy and Corti came out in agreement with the reuniting of Dobrogea with Romania,⁹⁸ which in the end made Suvalov accept a frontier line starting from Rasova in the direction of Silistra with the border point at the Black Sea not to go beyond Mangalia,⁹⁹ a proposal which the congress accepted. With the agreement of the plenipotentiaries from Russia, Salisbury also added Island of the Snakes. Other detailed matters were left to the drafting commission.¹⁰⁰

Three days after being received by the congress, M. Kogalniceanu wrote to Bucharest that the Romanian delegates had to state that they would be subject to the congress' verdict, but that they had refused. They took "no commitment and the country has the full liberty to declare itself." They were told that the terms "exchange or compensation are carefully eliminated from the text."¹⁰¹

The work of the congress concluded on 1 July 1878 with the signing of the Treaty of Berlin, an act of special importance for the Romanian people. Article XLIII recognizes Romania's independence as a condition of Article XLIV, which provides that in Romania "the difference of religious conditions and confessions cannot be opposed by anyone as a reason for exclusion or incapacity with regard to enjoying political and civil rights."¹⁰² In Article XLV of the treaty, Russia incorporated from Romania the southwestern part of Bessarabia, a territory limited "on the west by the thalweg of the Prut, on the south by the thalweg of the branch of the Chilia and mouth of the Stara-Stambul."¹⁰³ In this same article the islands of the Danube Delta and Island of the Snakes, the sanjak of Tulcea with the districts (kazal) of Chilia, Sulina, Mahmudia, Isaccea, Tulcea, Macin, Babadag, Hirsova, Constanta (Kustendje) and Medgidia are reunited with Romania, to which are added "the territory situated in southern Dobrogea up to a line whose starting point is east of Silistra and reaching the Black Sea to the south of Mangalia." It was established that the border should be fixed on the spot by the "European commission instituted to mark the frontier of Bulgaria."¹⁰⁴ It should be noted that on the territorial matter the treaty does not provide for any exchange and the territories comprising Dobrogea, the part of ancient Dacia, were reunited with the mother country.

There also are other articles regarding Romania directly or indirectly. Article XLVII shows that division of the waters and

fishering is to be subject "to the arbitration of the European Commission on the Danube";¹⁰⁵ article XLVIII provides that Romania will not take the transit rights for the goods crossing it; article XLIX provides that conventions may be concluded to regulate the privileges and duties of the consulates in Romania, with the rights gained to "remain in force as long as they are not changed through joint agreement"; article L shows that, until conclusion of a treaty, "Romanian citizens traveling or residing in the Ottoman Empire and Ottoman citizens traveling or residing in Romania will enjoy the rights guaranteed to the citizens of other European powers," while Article LI shows that Romania will replace for the Porte the enterprises of public works on the territory freed from Ottoman domination; Article LII: War ships may not navigate on the Danube, but only "light vessels for the river police and customs services," with the stationing of the powers at the mouths of the Danube able to "go up to Galati";¹⁰⁶ Article LIII: Romania will be part of the European Commission on the Danube, with the commission's duties stretching up to Galati, "in complete independence of territorial authority"; Article LIV: The European commission may prolong its mandate; Article LV: For the Danube from the Iron Gates up to Galati,¹⁰⁷ the regulating of navigation, river police and supervision are to be done "by the European Commission on the Danube, assisted by the delegations of riverside states"; Article LVI: The European commission will be concerned "with maintaining the lighthouse on the Island of the Snakes."¹⁰⁸ Although the job of the seven big European powers who negotiated for the small states and Romania, the Treaty of Berlin still wrote down an independent life for the Romanian state. One of the three empires which pressed on Romania in various ways having been defeated, the free Romania could fashion a broader road for creating its future.

Without awaiting the end of the congress' work, I. C. Bratianu and M. Kogalniceanu returned to Bucharest, bringing Romania's independence and return of Dobrogea to the old part of the country, although conditions of losing a large territory and imposing a certain change in the constitution. In the defense of national territorial integrity, aided by all the Romanian people, they were in a firm and principled position which they did not give up despite all the pressures exerted on them. They rejected accepting the territorial exchange demanded of them, feeling that the reuniting of Dobrogea with the mother country, as decided by the congress, was just and legitimate.

The full independence of the country, obtained through great sacrifices, made it possible for Romania to develop its economy and culture at a more lively rate and created conditions for completing national state unity and for the move forward on the path of progress.

FOOTNOTES

1. Titu Maiorescu, "Parliamentary Discourses" on the political development of Romania under the rule of Carol I, Vol II (1876-1881), Socec Publishing House, Bucharest 1897.
2. Frederic Dame, "Histoire de la Roumanie Contemporaine depuis l'avenement des Princes Indigenes Jusqu'a Nos Jours (1822-1900) Paris, 1900.
3. M. Iorga, "History of the Romanians," Vol X, Bucharest 1939.
4. R. W. Seton-Watson, "Histoire des Roumains. De l'epoque Roumaine a l'achevement de l'unite," Les Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1937.
5. Vasile Maciu, "Comment la Roumanie a Conquis son Independence" in REVUE ROUMAINE D'HISTOIRE IV 1965, No 3, pp 523-545 and in the volume "Mouvements Nationaux et Sociaux Roumains au XIX-e Siecle," Editions de l'Academie de la Republique Socialiste de Roumanie, Bucharest 1971.
6. Vasile Maciu, "La Roumanie et la Conference de Constantinople de Decembre 1876-Janvier 1877" in "Idem, Mouvements Nationaux et Sociaux au XIX-e Siecle," Bucharest 1971 p 242.
7. "Documents on the History of Romania. The War for Independence" (in continuation "Documents of the War for Independence"), Vol II, Publishing House of the Academy of the SRR Bucharest 1952 p 112.
8. MONITORUL OFICIAL AL ROMANIEI No 110, 15 May 1877 p 3264.
9. Ibidem, 19 May 1877 p 3322.
10. "Documents of the War for Independence," Vol II p 669.
11. Ministry of Foreign Affairs "Official Documents": The Situation of the Romanians in Turkey. Ottoman Constitutionality. The Guarantee of Romania's Neutrality. Retrocession of the Mouths of the Danube. Romania's Independence. The With Turkey. Violation of the Red Cross by the Ottoman Armies--presented to the legislative bodies, Bucharest 1878 p 110.
12. Ibidem, pp 122-124.

13. Demetre A. Sturdza "Charles I-er Roi de Roumanie. Chronique-Actes" Documents Publiés par... Vol II 1876-1877 Bucharest 1904 p 794.
14. "Official Documents from Diplomatic Correspondence of 5 October 1877 Until 15 September 1878 Presented to the Legislative Bodies in the 1880-1881 Session," Bucharest 1880 p 10 (in continuation "The Official Documents of 1880")
15. Ibidem p 17.
16. Ibidem p 22.
17. Ibidem.
18. "Acts and Documents From the Diplomatic Correspondence of M. Kogalniceanu Regarding the 1877-1878 Romanian War for Independence" published by Vasile Kogalniceanu, Vol I, Fas-cicle I, Bucharest 1893, p 22 (in continuation "Acts of M. Kogalniceanu").
19. Ibidem p 23.
20. "Documents of 1880, p 29.
21. Ibidem p 30.
22. Ibidem p 32.
23. MONITORUL OFICIAL AL ROMANIEI 27 January 1878 p 450.
24. Ibidem p 451.
25. Ibidem p 451.
26. "Documents of 1880" p 38.
27. Ibidem p 33.
28. Demetre A. Sturdza "Charles I-er Roi de Roumanie" Vol II (Suite) p 566.
29. Ibidem p 566.
30. "Documents of 1880" p 42.
31. Ibidem p 55.

32. "The Correspondence of Gen Iancu Ghica, 2 April 1877-8 April 1878," published with an introduction and notes by General Rosetti, Bucharest 1930, p 150 (in continuation "The Correspondence of Iancu Ghica").
33. "Documents of the War for Independence" Vol IX Publishing House of the Academy of the People's Republic of Romania, Bucharest 1955 p 363.
34. Ibidem p 367.
35. Ibidem p 365.
36. "Documents of 1880" p 79.
37. "Correspondence of Iancu Ghica" p 160.
38. "Official Documents of 1880" p 67.
39. "Correspondence of Iancu Ghica" p 156.
40. "Official Documents of 1880" p 88.
41. Ibidem p 116.
42. Ibidem.
43. Ibidem pp 117-121.
44. Ibidem p 118.
45. Ibidem p 121.
46. Ibidem p 122.
47. Ibidem p 124.
48. Gh. I. Bratianu, "Bismarck and Ion C. Bratianu" in REVISTA ISTORICA ROMANA, Vols V-VI of MCMXXXV-VI p 91.
49. Ibidem.
50. "Memoirs of King Carol I (By an Eyewitness)", Vol XIII p 89.
51. Ion C. Bratianu, "Acts and Speeches" Vol III Bucharest 1930 p 282.
52. "Memoirs of King Carol I (By an Eyewitness)" Vol XIII p 88.
53. Ibidem p 93.

54. Ibidem Vol XIV p 7.
55. Ibidem p 9.
56. "Affaires Etrangeres. Documents Diplomatiques. Affaires d'Orient. Congres de Berlin 1878" Paris p 53 (in continuation "Congres 1878").
57. "Official Documents of 1880" p 158.
58. Ibidem p 161.
59. Ibidem p 160.
60. Ibidem p 161.
61. Ibidem p 160.
62. Ibidem p 162.
63. Ibidem p 164.
64. Ibidem.
65. Ibidem p 165.
66. Ibidem.
67. Ibidem.
68. Ibidem.
69. Ibidem. p 166.
70. Ibidem.
71. Ibidem p 167.
72. Ibidem.
73. Ibidem pp 169-170.
74. Ibidem p 170.
75. Ibidem p 171.
76. "Congres 1878" p 155.
77. Ibidem p 156.
78. Ibidem p 157.

79. Ibidem.
80. Ibidem p 158.
81. Ibidem.
82. Ibidem pp 159-160.
83. Ibidem p 160.
84. "Official Documents of 1880" p 171.
85. R. W. Seton-Watson, "Histoire des Roumains de l'epoque Roumaine a l'achevement de l'unite" p 383.
86. "Official Documents of 1880" p 171.
87. "Congres 1878" p 162.
88. "The Congress of Berlin. Acts and Speeches of the Plenipotentiaries of His Highness Carol I Ruler of Romania," Bucharest 1878 p 9.
89. Ibidem p 10.
90. Ibidem p 11.
91. Ibidem.
92. Ibidem p 12.
93. "Congres 1878" p 166.
94. Ibidem.
95. Ibidem.
96. Ibidem p 167.
97. Ibidem p 168.
98. Ibidem pp 168-169.
99. Ibidem p 170.
100. Ibidem.
101. "Official Documents of 1880" p 176.

- 102. "Congres 1878" pp 290-291.
- 103. Ibidem p 291.
- 104. Ibidem.
- 105. Ibidem.
- 106. Ibidem p 292.
- 107. Ibidem p 292.
- 108. Ibidem p 293.

8071
CSO: 2700

YUGOSLAVIA

STANE DOLANC INTERVIEWED AT HIS VACATION HOME ON KORCULA

Split SLOBODNA DALMACIJA in Serbo-Croatian 12 Aug 78 p 3

[Interview with Stane Dolanc, secretary of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, by Miljenko Smoj editor of SLOBODNA DALMACIJA]

Text For many years Stane Dolanc has spent his vacation days at Prizba cove on the island of Korcula. The editor was visiting the green cove for the first time and did not know where Dolanc resided, where his villa was. He asked fishermen and stopped pedestrians and they pointed out a house at the end of the cove. It was a simple weekend cottage, with a red roof and a terrace and garden. On the terrace he found Stane Dolanc, in an open shirt and shorts, staring at the sea.

He had been told that photographers were coming. You know how that goes. "We won't annoy you, Comrade Dolanc, just a couple shots for SLOBODONA DALMACIJA, and in 5 minutes we will be finished."

A reporter attached himself to the photographers, bringing the following conversation:

Dolanc "That is not what we agreed to, comrades. I am on vacation, I'm not in the mood for interviews."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "God forbid, Comrade Dolanc. We didn't think of that for a moment."

Dolanc "Sit down, comrades. What can I offer you?"

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "Just a glass of wine, if you wish," but I the editor thought how in the good Dalmatian tradition at least a little chocolate would accompany it. "Well, Comrade Dolanc, how are you? Does this south wind bother you?"

Dolanc "What south wind? This is not a south wind, it's a gale!"

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA And I am supposed to be a fisherman's son. I was uncomfortable: I had asked the first question and it had come out wrong, and the prestige of a Dalmatian, a man of the sea, had been hit. I had come to see the day when a Slovenian, even if it was Comrade Dolanc, would teach me what kind of weather was on the coast and what wind was blowing.

Dusk was falling, the sea was running strongly and filling the cove, pouring over the sea wall, and the wind was resounding in a strange manner, but I still didn't believe it to be a gale. He felt my disbelief and yelled to a fisherman who was swaying in his small boat on the other side of the cove: "Hey, Uncle Karo, what sort of wind is this?"

Answer "A gale, a real gale, Stane."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA What remained but to swallow my pride and ask another question.

Question "Who are your neighbors, Comrade Dolanc?"

Answer "Chiefly fishermen and workers. You just heard Kara Franulovic, he is the grandfather of the tennis player Zeljko. He is a nice, interesting, and energetic old man. He is 86 years old, but he can still do acrobatics and walk on his hands. Nearby one of my Slovenian countrymen is building a house, and over there is a convent, while beyond the house there is a nudist beach."

Question "How do you get along in that varied society?"

Answer "Splendidly! We are all good neighbors to each other. Just when I arrived in Prizba the nuns sent me a cake. I responded by sending them the first fish I caught.

The fishermen met me with squid. They know I like it. And the day before yesterday, on the dock where I swim with my grandson, a whole flock of nude foreigners appeared. The militiaman chased them away, but I snapped at him: 'What in God's name are you doing? Can't you see that there are attractive young girls there, you could have chased away only the ugly ones!' The response was: 'Well, then do it your way.'" And then he said: "And don't you nudge me" to his wife in a laughing reproach as she quietly and almost unnoticed brought wine out to the table, and served him coffee.

"For God's sake don't write down everything he says to you," desperately said his wife as Comrade Dolanc choked with laughter, as if he knew in advance how his house censor would react to this anecdote.

Question "You visit Prizba every year, Comrade Dolanc. When and how did that begin? Why do you always come to Prizba, when there are other nicer places and coves on the Adriatic?"

Answer "He nearly burst with: "There isn't, nowhere is there a place like my Prizba! I have traveled nearly all over the world, I have seen many seas and admired beautiful views, but, believe me, there is no sea like the Adriatic, and nowhere is there such lovely scenery as our islands, particularly Korcula, Mljet, and Lastovo. Every day that scenic beauty fascinates me anew, and I can't get my fill of looking. And there is no cove as lovely as my Prizba!"

Question "And how did this love start?"

Answer "You know how it usually happens. My wife is from here and I came here for her. I have been coming now for 30 years without a break. The children are grown and are already on their own, and I have a grandson, the small captain of this port. He should be arriving any moment now.

"I remember my first visit as if it were yesterday. There were no buses yet and I came from Vela Luka in a truck."

Question I asked him about the Franulovices, the family of my wife, but I didn't know there were so many of them in Blato.

Answer "But which Franulovic? I can't explain. The names and nicknames are so numerous they get confused.

"Maybe you mean brother Ivan Amerikanac, the one they call Tripica? Recently his daughter came from Slavonia with a little boy. So I found both the woman and the son."

Question "What do you mean, Slavonia?"

Answer "Here on the islands they often mix up Slavonia and Slovenia.

"For 24 years we have been spending the summer in her parents' house, a fisherman's house that is more than 200 years old. It has an open cooking hearth and a tripod for hanging a cooking pot. The first few years we came on a donkey, but progress came and we started to come up to Prizba on a mule. It was nice then, peaceful, quiet, and the sea was rich with fish, but how else could it be when only one man, from Rovinj, had nets."

Question "And how is our countryman from Rovinj, is he still active", I asked about my old acquaintance and the long-time president of the opicina in Blato.

Answer "He is in Blato, the poor fellow has been ill. Then only he had nets, but now every house has lots of fishing gear, they all fish, throw out their lines and pull them in, and cry when there are no fish. Yet still we all eat every day. Everyone pulls out a kilogram a day at least. And what about poachers? There are enough of them here too. They can hardly wait for my vacation to end so they can start setting off their mines again."

Question "Do you go fishing?"

Answer "How can you ask? I am an old wolf at fishing, I fish with the professional fishermen. Just yesterday we came back from Lastovo island."

Question "And do you sleep like a fisherman on the boat?"

Answer "And where would I except on a fishing boat up on the front deck. We fish, we spread our nets, we put out our fishing lines, cook, eat, sleep, and snore like a saw sawing in the middle of the boat. I always get up among the first, before 3 o'clock I am up. I fix some coffee and blow an ancient fisherman's horn to wake up and get up the lazy ones. The other day at Lastovo we were sleeping in Skrivena luka. Before dawn the horn sounded, and all the donkeys on shore responded by braying. What a lovely chorus to greet the new day!"

Question "Was the catch good?"

Answer "Very good. We filled several boxes with fish."

Question "And as an equal member of the fishing cooperative, you surely get your share of the earnings?"

Lucky Berlinguer!

Answer "Not exactly. The cooperative is clever, and out of respect they permit me to choose what I want first. Naturally, as propriety demands, I have to respond to that attention by always taking less than I deserve."

"And of course, my roguish fishermen enjoy tricking me every time. But let them, I don't lack for fish. This year, you know, the fish are acting oddly. For example, the lobsters. In previous years we caught them at 60 to 70 meters, but this year they are found at 20 meters."

Question "Since we are talking about fishing and fishermen, Berlinguer comes to mind. I read that he, like you, spends his vacation in a fishing village on Sardinia. He is surrounded by fishermen, he doesn't want to see anybody, and as long as his vacation lasts he wants to keep out of contact."

Answer "Lucky Berlinguer if he can do that. Unfortunately, I cannot. I constantly have to interrupt my vacation. Three times a week couriers come from Belgrade, and the other day I had to attend a meeting at Sinj, then the Mediterranean games meeting in Split, and then back to Belgrade. I have never utilized all the vacation time to which the law entitles me."

Question "While you are on vacation do you count the days like other workers, saying half of the vacation is over, or 'one more week and the free time is over?'"

Answer Comrade Dolanc laughed. "I know how many vacation days have passed, but I don't wail quite that way. When it is necessary, nothing is difficult, even if it is to unglue myself from Prizba."

Night was already falling, but the small talk continued. Mrs Dolanc brought out another bottle of wine, cut some cheese, and served peaches and grapes from Stane's garden. In front of the house they had planted a miniature vineyard, with only 24 vines. Yesterday they had picked the first grapes.

Comrade Dolanc bragged, turning to his wife: "There were at least 4 kilos, weren't there? And there will be at least that much more."

One by one the other members of the family arrived and crowded around the table. A son, chief of "public relations" in a Ljubljana commercial enterprise, "Emon," with his wife and the small "captain of the port," who liked to frighten passersby by shouting "Look out, mines" at the site of the construction of a new house. A daughter arrived with her boy friend; she is studying law. The conversation multiplied and the story of the construction of their new house was begun. Everyone pitched in, digging and carrying rocks on hods. The son attacked the father:

"Don't you brag, you have done less than we have. All you know how to do is sit and give orders. Put that rock there, move that one, it doesn't look right."

Comrade Dolanc joked: "I only provided ideological guidelines."

A fine family atmosphere developed in which jokes and poking fun and family tales and anecdotes followed each other in quick succession.

Concern About Blato

Comrade Dolanc began to tell how his two Slovenian attendants had been thrown out of a hotel in Prizba recently. "They went on an official trip, and when they returned their room had been given to some Austrians, and their things had been packed and sent to some sort of private room, while they were still paying the full price for the hotel room just like the other guests.

"Don't go into that, Stane, don't you write that," again chimed in the censor.

The chief of "public relations" joined in: "In this house you can say anything but for God's sake don't say any ugly unseemly word about Blato and the people of the town. Our mama protects her own like a lioness. We have a lemon tree in front of the house and at night someone came and picked the lemons. Who else would do that but the local people, to pull such a prank."

The mother would not hear of such a thing: "What do you mean, local people, my fellow townfolks would not do such a thing."

"And she calmed down when I said she was right, because I had seen how three suspicious Slovenians had been eyeing that lemon tree."

/ SLOBODNA DALMACKJA / In this house there would be a job for a philologist to study how all variations emerge when the Slovenian language clashes and

unites with the archaic idiom of Blato. True linguistic equality reigns. Everyone speaks as he or she wants and in the language that the moment dictates. Now there is pure literary Serbo-Croatian, now Slovenian, now some Cakavian dialect.

The courier, or perhaps it is the local postman, I don't know, brings in a bundle of fresh newspapers that have come on the ferry boat.

Question "Comrade Dolanc, do you read quite a bit while you are on vacation?"

Answer "Well I brought a couple of novels by Slovenian authors, and I read Churchill's 'The Private War' with particular interest. It gives a fine explanation of his role in the intervention against the October Revolution.

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA A mosquito bit me, and I instinctively slapped my neck.

Dolanc "Yes, there are mosquitoes, even though they have dusted twice. But that has its good side too. I go to bed earlier and I don't watch television."

Question "How do you pass the vacation time when you aren't fishing?"

Answer "I get up early, at 5:30, sit on the terrace, sip coffee, look at the sea, and rest. Then there is breakfast and a swim with my grandson, over there on the pier. I go for walks, chat with my neighbors, and the day passes quickly. By about 9 p.m. I am in bed."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA But it was already approaching 9 p.m. The young people had risen from the table and it was time for the newspaperman's visit to end, but we had just begun talking about the specialties of the Dalmatian cuisine, with considerable pride. Few people know it today, but Comrade Dolanc recited a list of venerable fishermen's recipes. He told how last year Comrade Kardelj had come to visit him and how later he had been angry that no one on Brioni could fix fish as they did at Prizba.

Comrade Dolanc's daily menu is completely Dalmatian. Today for dinner they had fish stew, and for supper they had cabbage cooked in oil. I know you readers, and how interested you will be to hear what wines are drunk at his table.

His wine is a white Blato local wine, bottled table wine produced by the vineyard right in Blato. His friends even send that cheap bottled wine to him in Ljubljana.

Split and the Mediterranean Games of Split

Question "Comrade Dolanc, since you regularly spend your vacation in

Prizba, you have often met with the Hajduk team and with Jugoplastika, and now you often go to Split to the Mediterranean games. You have gained special sympathy in our Dalmatia. Now we hear more and more often: 'Dolanc is one of us.'"

Answer "I have been connected with Dalmatia since 1947, the year when as an officer I was transferred to Zadar. Even then I played a little basketball with the late Sovitti. Zadar was in the first league then. Later I was able to be the basketball coach, and I coached Rate Tvrđić, Skansi, and Solman, who were just boys then and played for the youth team. I liked Jugoplastika, they were good fellows.

"Along with Olimpija and Partizan, I also like the Hajduk team. Oh, I just remembered: tell my friend Tito Kirigin that he still owes me a fish dinner. I bet him that Hajduk would beat Crvena zvezda in the Cup finals. I even guessed the point spread. That was when they threw snowballs at me, do you remember?"

Dolanc "Well, bravo, let me ask you something: Katalinić has gone to serve his military obligation, and the goalie Budincević is unwell. Who will defend Hajduk; the team will truly be handicapped.

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "How do you know that, Comrade Dolanc?"

Dolanc "Well, I read the sports pages, after all."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "You know, Comrade Dolanc, even though you are one of us, my fellow residents of Split are still a little angry with you, since you won't let them exceed their budget for building for the Mediterranean games by some 10 billion dinars. They say: 'That Slovene won't let us budge!'"

Dolanc "They will continue to be angry. But they should know that such facilities will not be built anywhere else in the country with such a favorable financial arrangement, as the one for the Mediterranean games. Those are colossal investments, but in perspective, Dalmatia and Split as a great sports center had to have such facilities and it is a good investment."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "Partly because of the Mediterranean games of Split, the city has had to undertake other major efforts and investments."

Dolanc "I know all about the roads and the flooding of the railroad line, and the tunnel through the Marjan section, but certainly you aren't going to request that others pay for that for you?"

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "Believe me, Comrade Dolanc, Split will be a worthy host of the Mediterranean games."

Dolanc "I am convinced of it, even though the people of Split and of Dalmatia have that 'we'll do it easy' philosophy. I believe that Split will succeed, particularly since the whole Republic of Croatia is very concerned with its success. Croatia has truly become involved in the Split Mediterranean games.

"As long as we are on that subject, you know that I have just come from Split and that I received a large number of anonymous letters from the people there talking about exaggerated and unnecessary expenditures and about your squabbles concerning hotel locations."

/ SLOBODNA DALMACIJA / I changed the subject immediately and began to complain about the great lag in construction of tourist facilities in Dalmatia.

We'll Reach Agreement!

/ Question / "The innkeepers complain that the conditions for building new hotels are practically impossible."

/ Dolanc / "If that is the case, if they can't make the financial picture clear, they shouldn't be building. I recall," continued Comrade Dolanc, "when a new hotel was opened in the Dubrovnik area. It had expensive chandeliers, selected marble, and elegant luxury accommodations. The next day at a meeting of the Dubrovnik political organization I asked the comrades what the financial load, the interest rates and annual capital returns would be, and whether such a hotel could operate at a profit. That was just before the Tenth Party Congress, and do you know what one of them told me: 'We are waiting for a decision by the Tenth Congress.'"

/ SLOBODNA DALMACIJA / I offered him all sorts of explanations. "The roses are not blooming for us, Comrade Dolanc, either in shipping or in the fishing fleet. Before the war we had a merchant fleet that was among the 20 largest in the world. Today we are not seen anywhere. Even countries without a coast are catching up to us."

/ Dolanc / "Well what of it. Why does that worry you? You know that we have a powerful fleet because of certain traditions, of prestige, and that we are waving ships' flags that will beat us over the head. The merchant marine is a branch of industry like any other branch, and there should not be any songs sung on that score. In the merchant marine and in ship building we reach agreements as to what we are going to do. I do not blame our shippers one bit for ordering ships abroad when it is cheaper to do that."

/ SLOBODNA DALMACIJA / All the lights were going out in the cove. Prizba was already sleeping. The wind had stopped, and the sea had become calm. The mosquitoes were unmercifully painful, but the conversation was lively as we jumped from one subject to another.

You should have seen how Comrade Dolanc banged the table harshly, how he flared up when I mentioned to him the graft and corruption that is an evil of growing intensity in our society.

/ Dolanc / "I know, I know, and that is villainous, criminal, beastly. Write it just that way, word for word. It is particularly frightening to see the extent to which it has taken hold in health services.

"It tramples on all human ethics to utilize illness and the sick, that is monstrous. An end should be made to that! And the press could play a role in so doing."

Harsh Words About Graft

Question "Since you mentioned the press, Comrade Dolanc, what do you think about it, how do you evaluate it?"

Answer "It has clearly made progress in recent years. The quality has improved. It is our position that the press must have the maximum freedom, but with full responsibility of the people who work for it. And do you know who that bothers greatly, who resists the idea?"

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "I know, Comrade Dolanc--reporters."

Dolanc told me of examples when once a Zagreb paper, and another time a Belgrade paper had shortened and censored his speeches.

Dolanc "And what can I do, am I to protest when they throw out of my speeches the things that seem doubtful to them?"

Question "The people of Split would like to know how President Tito enjoyed his stay in Split?"

Answer "As far as I know and according to what he told me, he found it very pleasant. The weather was nice and he had some pleasant times, he was able to rest up and be refreshed."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA It was already past 10 p.m., and high time for me to rise and offer my thanks.

"Just one more question remains, Comrade Dolanc," I said, already standing on the steps, after we had shook hands and said goodbye to our hosts.

Question "What are you going to do when you retire some day?"

Answer "I have thought about that," he answered readily. "I will spend half the year in my Slovenia, and the other half here at Prizba with my fishermen and my friends. I have no fears that I will be bored as a pensioner."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA He showed us the way with a flashlight.

Dolanc "Slowly, don't fall."

SLOBODNA DALMACIJA "Thank you, Comrade Dolanc."

12131
CSO: 2800

END